OINOS:

A DISCUSSION

OF

THE BIBLE WINE QUESTION.

MR. & MRS. A. W. HARVEY
910 W. 17th Street
Bloomington, Indiana

ALBERTA C. HARVEY
RT. RT 2 BX 279
MIDDLETOWN, IND.
47356

$1.00
32

OINOS:

A DISCUSSION

OF

THE BIBLE WINE QUESTION.

BY

LEON C. FIELD, A.M.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION

BY

BISHOP H. W. WARREN, D.D.

Vetustis novitatem dare, novis auctoritatem, obsoletis nitorem, obscuris lucem, fastiditis gratiam, dubiis fidem.—PLINY, NAT. HIST. PRAEF.

NEW YORK:
PHILLIPS & HUNT.
CINCINNATI:
WALDEN & STOWE.
1883.

COPYRIGHT 1883, BY

PHILLIPS & HUNT,

NEW YORK.

PREFACE.

THE following work has already appeared, in large part, in the pages of the "Methodist Quarterly Review" for 1882. The last section and the Appendix are entirely new matter. As the earlier portion of the book is printed from the stereotype plates of the "Quarterly," many changes and additions, which were deemed desirable, were thereby rendered impracticable. In order to supplement such deficiencies, as well as to answer certain criticisms, and bring the work up to the latest date, the Appendix has been prepared. It was not possible to refer to this on the several pages to which its topics relate, but the pages are themselves indicated in the respective appendixes.

In the preparation of this work I have aimed especially at fullness and accuracy. It has been my endeavor to make it an authority on which students of the Bible wine question might rely. In almost every instance I have gone to original sources of information, and in the few cases where these were inaccessible I have given the best attainable authority on the subject. I have purposed to write nothing which could not be verified, and I have been careful to place the means of verification in the reader's hand. That I have made no mistakes and fallen into no inaccuracies is more than I dare hope; but I have conscientiously and industriously labored to avoid them. I have striven, in the words of Pliny, *vetustis novitatem dare, novis auctoritatem, obsoletis nitorem, obscuris lucem, fastiditis gratiam, dubiis fidem*, "to give freshness to what is old, authority to what is new, brightness to what has become tarnished, light to what is obscure, acceptability to what is slighted, and credibility to what is doubtful," which Pliny truthfully describes as *res ardua*, "no easy task."

The list of authorities which I have consulted is sufficiently indicated in the foot-notes, although many that I have had at hand find no mention there. This is especially true of works

written to controvert the position which this book is intended to defend. I have not thought it necessary, for instance, to refer to Wilson's "Bible Wines," since I was replying in particular to such later and more current writings as Chancellor Crosby's "A Calm View of the Temperance Question," (in "Christ and Modern Thought," Boston Monday Lectures, 1880–81, pp, 141–143;) Professor Bumstead's "The Biblical Sanction for Wine," (in "The Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, pp. 47–116;) Dr. Moore's "The Bible Wine Question," (in "The Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, pp. 80–113,) and his "Sacramental Wine," (in "The Presbyterian Review," January, 1882, pp. 78–107.) I am under very great obligations, and these only imperfectly acknowledged in the notes, to "The Temperance Bible Commentary," by Dr. F. R. Lees and Rev. Dawson Burns, which, though not beyond criticism as to some of its details, is on the whole the most important contribution ever made to the scriptural phase of the temperance question.

Though this work is intended for scholars, and all its quotations from foreign sources are given in their original tongues, yet it is believed that it will prove equally available for popular use, since the passages in foreign languages are accompanied by translations, and, in the case of the Hebrew, by transliterations as well.

A single word further may be necessary in explanation of the form of the discussion. The work was written in conformity with the original title given to the first article as published in "The Methodist Quarterly Review" for January, 1882, namely, "Was Jesus a Wine-Bibber?" That question, as a starting-point, determined the course of the argument and the arrangement of the material. But yielding to the counsels of those in whose judgment I place confidence, I have exchanged that title for another, which better describes the broader ground covered by the discussion.

In conclusion I may be permitted to express the hope that this volume will commend itself to the sober judgment and the candid scholarship of its readers, and contribute something toward the spread of scriptural temperance over the land.

LEON C. FIELD.

BOSTON, *October*, 1882.

INTRODUCTION.

IN its hard fight for perfection the race wins but one battle at a time, and that only after long and hard fighting over each skirmish-line, rifle-pit, outpost, redoubt, etc., till finally by grand combinations the citadel is taken. This is true whether the battle be for civil liberty, freedom of conscience, the ballot for women, emancipation of slaves, Christian doctrine and practice in the relation of capital and labor, santification of the home, or temperance.

The positions already won, or partially so, are the scientific demonstration of the non-necessity of alcohol to a man in sickness, and its harmfulness to a man in health; the right of each individual to decline its use without being called a coward; the right of men and women to organize against saloons as a public nuisance; the right of States to regulate or prohibit the manufacture and sale of that which creates paupers, idiots, and criminals for honest labor to support. What centuries of hard fighting these various victories signify!

One of the battles yet raging is whether the wine-bibber and manufacturer can hide themselves behind the example of Christ, the Saviour of the world. As an aid to victory in this fight, this new piece of ordnance has been brought forward. It is of large caliber, well rifled, carefully loaded, and not liable to recoil. I wish it might be every-where trained on the enemy, and made to open fire.

HENRY W. WARREN.

ATLANTA, GA., *July* 4, 1882.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION v

SECTION I.

THE QUESTION STATED AND ITS IMPORTANCE NOTED 1

SECTION II.

THE CHARGE AND ITS AUTHORS 14

SECTION III.

PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION 17

SECTION IV.

EXAMINATION OF THE CHARGE 53

SECTION V.

THE POSITIVE ARGUMENT 97

APPENDIX 131

GENERAL INDEX 153

TEXTUAL INDEX 161

OINOS:

A DISCUSSION OF THE BIBLE WINE QUESTION.

I. The Question Stated and its Importance Noted.

More than eighteen hundred years ago it was said of Jesus Christ, "Behold a man gluttonous, and a wine-bibber, a friend of publicans and sinners." (Matt. xi, 19; Luke vii, 34.) One particular of that accusation men have continued to repeat until this day. They have said, and they have not ceased to say, Jesus was a drinking man. His enemies have insisted upon it, that they might cast disgrace upon his character and discredit upon his cause. Lovers of strong drink have affirmed it, that they might shelter themselves under the cover of his example. Some of his most candid and conscientious followers have felt themselves compelled to admit the charge, and, without pleading his practice as a precedent, have attempted his defense. Others, perhaps no less conscientious or candid, have frankly avowed that no defense is demanded, but that his course as a moderate drinker is to be copied. It would seem as if this latter class had of late entered into a conspiracy to strengthen their own position by a determined attack on the lines of their opponents. For, at the opening of the present year,* and almost simultaneously, Chancellor Crosby on the platform of the Monday Lectureship, Dr. Moore in the pages of the "Presbyterian Review," and Prof. Bumstead in the pages of the "Bibliotheca Sacra," made vigorous onslaught on those who hold that the Bible does not lend its sanction to the use of intoxicating beverages, and, in particular, on all who quote the example of Christ in favor of total abstinence. "No unbiased reader," Chancellor Crosby declares,† "can for a moment doubt that wine as referred to in the Bible *passim* is an intoxicating drink, and that such wine was drunk by our Saviour and the early

* 1881. † "A Calm View of the Temperance Question."

Christians." And again, "It is impossible to condemn all drinking of wine as either sinful or improper without bringing reproach upon the Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles. There has been an immense amount of wriggling by Christian writers on this subject to get away from this alternative, but there it stands impregnable, *Jesus did use wine.*"* Dr. Moore affirms,† "Christ himself drank wine, the wine from which John the Baptist abstained, the wine which is classed with *sikera*, (Luke i, 15.) . . . Jesus himself drank the common wine of Palestine. . . . He did discriminate between an excessive and a temperate use of wine that could intoxicate." Prof. Bumstead asserts,‡ "The Bible sanctions the use of wine by the example of Christ. The sanction is undeniable and emphatic." And again,§ "The example of Christ is utterly irreconcilable with the theory of those who plead for total abstinence."

These are very serious charges. If they can be substantiated they will prove exceedingly damaging, if not utterly fatal, to the claims of total abstinence. The example of Christ must be regarded as determinative in this matter. If abstinence was his practice it is our duty. If moderation was his rule it may be our custom. To this extent we are in perfect accord with the authors just quoted. If their premises are correct their conclusion is inevitable. It is idle to deny this as many do. It will not do to say that Christ's indulgence in intoxicating drink would not concern us any more than his going barefoot, riding on an ass, or remaining unmarried. ‖ For this comparison holds good only in case the former like the latter belongs to the category of things indifferent; that is, such as may, *cæteris paribus*, be innocently done or left undone. To that sphere many who discountenance their use relegate alcoholic beverages. They regard the question of their use as purely "prudential," and decide it solely on grounds of expediency. But is their procedure valid, or their classification correct? Does the question belong to morals? Is wine-drinking under any circumstances right, or is it a sin *per se?* We believe

* "A Calm View of the Temperance Question."

† "Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 88.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 86. § *Ibid.*, p. 109.

‖ Wendell Phillips' Reply to Dr. Crosby in "Moderation vs. Total Abstinence," p. 43.

no better answer can be given than that of Tayler Lewis:* "There is one evil state of soul condemned throughout the Bible. It is *that state* to which we give the name intoxication, or inebriation. . . . It is the act of a person in health, voluntarily, and without any other motive or reason than the pleasurable stimulus, using any substance whatever, be it solid or liquid, to produce an unnatural change in his healthy mental and bodily state, either by way of exciting or quieting the nerves and brain, or quickening the pulse. This was wrong, a spiritual wrong—a sin *per se*—not a matter of excess merely, but wrong and evil in any, even the smallest, measure or degree." And we believe this all the more strongly, because the tendency of modern scientific investigation is to demonstrate the use of alcohol in any form or quantity in health to be a sin against one's own nature. And on this point we would be willing to abide by the decision of Prof. Bumstead, who devotes over thirteen pages of the "Bibliotheca Sacra" (48–61) to a discussion of the physiological action of alcohol. In summing up the results of "the latest and best science" in this regard, he says,† "There is a practically unanimous verdict from all authorities that alcohol is not needed, and is likely to do harm, in a state of perfect health." How accurately this states the situation will appear from such unimpeachable testimony as follows. Sir Henry Thompson, in his recent letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,‡ says, "The habitual use of fermented liquors to an extent far short of what is necessary to produce that condition, [drunkenness,] and such as is quite common in all ranks of society, injures the body and diminishes the mental power to an extent which, I think, few people are aware of." Sir William Gull, in his testimony before a select committee of the House of Lords,§ said: "The constant use of alcohol, even in *moderate measure*, may injure the nerve tissues and be deleterious to health; and one of the commonest things in society is, that people are injured by drink without being drunkards. It goes on so quietly that it is difficult to observe, even though it leads to degeneration of the tissues

* American preface to the "Temperance Bible Commentary," pp. xii, xiii.

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 60.

‡ Quoted in Judge Pitman's "Alcohol and the State," p. 38.

§ Reprinted and reiterated in "The Alcohol Question," a series of papers which originally appeared in the "Contemporary Review."

and spoils the health and the intellect. Short of drunkenness, I should say from my experience, that alcohol is the most destructive agent we are aware of in this country." Prof. Binz, of Bonn, who, with Dr. Anstie, of England, has been chiefly quoted in support of the food value of alcohol, says,* "While I thus share in the views of the late Dr. Anstie, so ably upheld in England, I do not hesitate, on the other hand, to declare with respect to the healthy organism, that I consider the use of alcohol in health as entirely superfluous." Dr. Parkes, of the British Army Medical School, arrives at these conclusions with reference to the use of spirits in the army,† which are equally applicable to all men under every circumstance: "Looking back to the evidence, it may be asked: Are there any circumstances of the soldier's life in which the issue of spirits is advisable, and if the question at any time lies between the issue of spirits and total abstinence, which is best? To me there seems but one answer. If spirits neither give strength to the body nor sustain it against disease, are not protective against cold and wet, and aggravate rather than mitigate the effects of heat—if their use, even in moderation, increases crime, injures discipline, and impairs hope and cheerfulness—if the severest trials of war have been not merely borne, but *most easily* borne, without them—if there is no evidence that they are protective against malaria or other diseases—then I conceive that the medical officer will not be justified in sanctioning their use under any circumstances." Dr. Henry Maudsley, the leading English authority on mental diseases, declares,‡ "If men took careful thought of the best use which they could make of their bodies, they would probably never take alcohol, except as they would take a dose of medicine, to serve some special purpose." Dr. B. W. Richardson says,§ "Thus by two tests science tries the comparison between alcohol and man. She finds in the body no structure made from alcohol; she finds in the healthy body no alcohol; she finds in those who have taken alcohol changes of the structure, and these are changes of disease. By all these proofs she declares

* "American Journal of the Medical Sciences," July, 1876, p. 262.

† "Manual of Practical Hygiene," (1873,) p. 284.

‡ "Responsibility in Mental Disease," p. 285.

§ "Moderate Drinking, For and Against, from Scientific Points of View," (1878,) p. 20.

alcohol to be entirely alien to the structure of man. It does not build up the body; it undermines and destroys the building." Dr. W. H. Dickinson of St. George's Hospital, England, after recounting, with accuracy, the structural changes which alcohol initiates, and the structural changes and consequent derangement and suspension of vital functions which it involves, aptly terms it "THE GENIUS OF DEGENERATION."* Dr. T. M. Coan, who aims to show that the latest science gives its sanction to moderate drinking, yet confesses,† "In robust and perfect health they (fermented liquors) are entirely superfluous; and they are sometimes injurious by promoting too much assimilation, making too much blood." Prof. William James, M.D., in a lecture delivered before the students of Harvard College, (May, 1881,) teaches‡ that the effects of alcohol, even in moderate quantities, are, "on the whole, likely to be injurious," and that its use "is not consistent with a state of perfect health." Dr. Markham, F.R.S., in reviewing the latest scientific utterances in regard to alcohol, well says,§ "It is scarcely possible to read fairly the works of distinguished physiologists who have discussed the question, without feeling that they have been, in spite of themselves, as it were, driven, by the legitimate consequences following from their premises, to the conclusion that alcohol is unnecessary and injurious to the human body."

An effort is made to escape the force of this evidence by an attempted discrimination between alcohol and beverages containing it, and between distilled and fermented liquors.‖ But the only distinction which exists is one of degree. Alcohol is always one and the same thing in kind, in whatever form or under whatever disguise we find it. It is "alcohol that gives type" to fermented as well as to distilled liquors, "and allies them too closely" to call for discrimination. "So far as our chemistry tells us, the form of the alcohol is just the same, only (in wines and beer) the flavoring and addition of actual food is different. We do not recognize this as 'the alembic in which

* E. M. Hunt, M.D., in "Alcohol as a Food and Medicine," p. 43, quoting from "The Lancet," 1872.

† The "State of the Alcohol Question," "Harper's Monthly," October, 1879.

‡ "Boston Daily Advertiser," May 19, 1881.

§ Quoted in Hunt's "Alcohol as a Food and Medicine," p. 59.

‖ "A Calm View," etc. "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 48.

nature has turned a powerful and dangerous element into a beneficent minister.'" * Careful and repeated experiments made by the most accurate and authoritative experts have fully demonstrated the fact that the alcohol in fermented liquors does not, except in the most infinitesimal degree, enter into any chemical combinations whatever.† The authorities whom Chancellor Crosby and Prof. Bumstead cite in support of the professed distinction between large and smaller amounts of alcohol do not cover the case. Prof. Parkes, whom the former imperfectly quotes, simply says, that science fails to give at present accurate information on the subject, and "the usual arguments for and against the use of alcohol cannot be held to settle the point." His other utterances, such as the one we have quoted above, and especially those in reply to Anstie as to food-value, etc., place him completely in opposition to our authors. Drs. Anstie and Binz are quoted by both in evidence of the consumption of alcohol in the body and so of its inferred value as a food. But neither quote Dr. Parkes' reply,‡ to which Anstie gave his assent, (in "The Practitioner," July, 1874, p. 27,) that "even if the complete destruction within certain limits were quite clear, this fact alone would not guide us to the dietetic value of alcohol. We have first to trace the effect of that destruction, and learn whether it is for good or evil. You seem to think that the destruction must give rise to useful force, but I cannot see that this is necessarily so." Dr. Parkes further says, that it is important to notice, in determining the weight of Anstie's testimony, that he sought to prove the food value of opium and tobacco as well as of alcohol. With reference to this subject, Dr. Ringer declares§ that "Even if the greater part of the alcohol is consumed, and thus ministers to the forces of the body, yet alcohol, by depressing functional activity, favoring degenerations, etc., may do more harm than any good it can effect by the force it sets free during its destruction." Dr. Davis, than whom few are better qualified to

* E. M. Hunt, M.D., Sanitary Editor of the New York "Independent," in the issue for Feb. 3, 1881, who refers to an expression of Chancellor Crosby in his "Calm View," etc.

† *Vide* Thudichum and Dupré, "On the Origin, Nature, and Varieties of Wine," London, 1872, p. 159.

‡ "The Practitioner," Feb., 1872, p. 85.

§ "Therapeutics," London, 1876, p. 276.

speak, states* that "the only *force* it (alcohol) develops is the catalytic *force* of *inertia*, by which it holds in check those natural molecular changes that would take place were it not present."

There is one practical argument which shows conclusively that the use of alcohol in any quantity is incompatible with man's perfect health and physical vigor. It is the fact that those who seek this, and who come nearest to its attainment, do so at the cost of total abstinence. We refer especially to athletes, whose training, from the time of Samson † and Milo ‡ to that of Hanlan and Dr. Carver, § has included abstinence from all alcoholic drinks. These men find that any indulgence in stimulants is fatal to that perfect "precision, decision, presence of mind, and endurance," on which their success so often hinges. ‖ And the conclusion is unavoidable, that these stimulants are equally damaging to the best physical condition of other people. ¶ In such a case their use is a sin against the body. And in saying this we need imply nothing as to that "large class of people," so pathetically described as living on "the confines of health." ** If people are sick let them take medicine. But let them also be sure that alcohol is what they need, and take care that they do not write their own prescriptions. Whoever else may claim a place in these ranks of invalidism, there was One who never belonged there. Christ possessed a perfect physical nature, in full health and vigor. If we can conceive of his taking alcohol into his system it must have been as a luxury, and how inconsistent such a conception is with his whole life of self-denial we need not now stop to consider. If he indulged in it at all, he must have done so without necessity, and at the conscious peril of the perfect delicacy of adjustment and harmony of function in that body, touched

* "The Medical Uses of Alcoholic Liquors," etc., in Report of Proceedings of the Ninth National Temperance Convention, held at Saratoga Springs, N. Y., June 21, 22, 1881, p. 195.

† Judges xiii, 7. ‡ Epictetus, Encheiridion, sec. 35.

§ "National Temperance Advocate," March, 1881. Art. "Athletes, Alcohol, and Tobacco."

‖ Dr. Richardson, "Effects of Alcohol" in "Ten Lectures on Alcohol," pp. 4–6.

¶ A similar line of argument is suggested by the statistics of life insurance companies. Total abstainers have a much greater longevity than moderate drinkers. (Parkes' "Manual of Practical Hygiene," p. 270.)

** "A Calm View," etc., "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 59.

to finer issues than any other mortal frame, whose absolute perfection was essential to the accomplishment of his divine mission. If, therefore, these teachings of experience and of science as to the injurious effects of alcohol, when taken in any form or quantity in health, be accepted—and they are every day receiving completer demonstration—they must settle for us the question whether He "in whom was no sin" ever used alcoholic beverages. Scripture, also, in all its statements must be consistent with this conclusion of science. That it is so it is the purpose of this paper to make plain. Enough, we think, has been said to show that this question is not merely a "prudential," but, in the very largest sense, a moral one.

There is another method, equally fallacious, by which the assertion that Christ used intoxicating wine is met. No denial is attempted or claim made that the act is an indifferent one, but the example of Christ in this particular is set aside on the same ground that the example of Moses with reference to polygamy, divorce, and slavery is ignored, namely, the imperfect moral development of the age, in consequence of which many evils were tolerated at the same time that provision for their eradication was made by the gradual enlightenment of the consciences of men. This is the position, among others, of the New York "Independent," from whose issue of March 11, 1874, Prof. Bumstead quotes * as follows: "But the fact that Christ used liquor and that the Bible allows it is no proof that we should. Things were allowable and right in the days of Moses that were not so in the days of Christ, and there has been some progress since in the application of abstract morals. . . . To appeal to the Bible in defense of alcoholic liquors is like appealing to it in defense of slavery. Christianity has educated the public conscience on these two subjects beyond the explicit teachings of Scripture." In a late issue † this same paper has restated its position, announcing the strange doctrine that "Christ's teaching and ordinary conduct were for his own age, not ours. The principles he taught are permanent, and new light may break out of them on the subjects of slavery and temperance." It is difficult to conceive how any sincere mind could put forth such propositions, or any sane mind take

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 111.

† "The Independent," March 24, 1881. Editorial notes.

refuge in them. If Christ's principles and practice conflicted, what claim has he upon our confidence? What severer impeachment of his character can be made than such a charge of inconsistency? What becomes of his omniscience or his sinlessness in the face of such a doctrine? What authority attaches to his teachings if they were purely local in their applications, and not only inadequate to the exigencies, but in conflict with the developed moral sense, of after ages? Surely,

> "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis
> Tempus eget."

We can no more believe than can Chancellor Crosby "that Christ and his apostles, on great moral questions and matters of moral conduct, gave example and precept that would not last."* And as to the attempted comparison between Moses and Christ, and between slavery, etc., and wine-drinking, it is important to observe, as Prof. Bumstead suggests,† that Christ "did not marry many wives; he did not hold slaves; he expressly superseded the Mosaic divorce by a higher and holier regulation." And if he indulged in alcoholic beverages he has given to that act a sanction such as no other practice, which an "educated public conscience" has called in question, ever received from him.

But this argument is put into another shape, and the change in our circumstances from those of ancient times is urged as an excuse for Christ's indulgence, and as a reason for our abstinence. "Had Jesus, living in our time, beheld the wide waste and wretchedness arising from inordinate appetites, can any one doubt on which side he would be found?" asks Mr. Beecher.‡ "If circumstances make wine-drinking wrong now, but made it right then, why should Christ not have gone out of his way to sanction it?" the "Independent" inquires,§ referring to a remark of Chancellor Crosby's in "The Evangelist," that "this was a custom which our Saviour went out of the way to sanction." And Rev. Dr. Plumb, in an essay read before a Ministerial Temperance Convention, held in Tremont Temple, Boston, March 8, 1881,‖ says: "When total abstinence is urged as our duty, because the biblical principle of

* "A Calm View," etc. † "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 111.
‡ "The Life of Jesus the Christ," vol. i, p. 192.
§ March 24, 1881, Editorial Notes. ‖ Boston "Daily Traveller," Mar. 8, 1881.

self-sacrifice for the good of others requires it, it is no escape from the binding force of this paramount obligation to plead that in a far-off age and land, in conditions thoroughly different from ours, there were men who were allowed a sparing use of wine, which, like all wine history knows any thing about, was capable of being used in excess." This argument involves two fallacies, either one of which is fatal. In the first place, there is no such difference as is represented between the evils connected with wine-drinking in ancient and in modern times. Professor Bumstead is correct on this point.* Drunkenness has prevailed in all ages of the world. The first historical reference to the use of wine records a case of intoxication, that of Noah's. (Gen. ix, 20–27.) The monuments of Egypt picture the gross drunkenness of that people, of both sexes, in private life, at public feasts, and on the occasion of great religious festivals.† One inscription speaks of a feast held at Denderah, known as the drinking-feast, and the goddess as the Goddess of Drunkenness.‡ Drunkenness had taken such a hold upon the people of China, more than a thousand years before Christ, as to threaten the ruin of the empire. This is clearly proven by "The Announcement about Drunkenness," an imperial edict believed to have been promulgated about 1116 B. C.§ The Rig-Veda, from beginning to end, shows that the ancient Aryan races of India must have been terrible drunkards, and must have believed their deities to have been the same. In the banqueting scenes of the Assyrians it is drinking and not eating that is represented.‖ Babylon fell into the hands of Cyrus while its inhabitants were buried in drunken revels.¶ Among the Persians "drunkenness even came to be sort of an institution. Once a year, at the feast of Mithras, the king of Persia, according to Duris, was bound to be drunk. A general practice arose of deliberating on all important affairs under the influence of wine, so that in every household, when a family crisis impended, intoxication was a duty."** So common was drunkenness among the Greeks

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, pp. 100, 109.

† Wilkinson's "Ancient Egypt," vol. i, pp. 52, 53. ‡ Eber's "Egypten," p. 326.

§ "Legge's Chinese Classics," vol. iii, pt. 1, p. 274.

‖ Rawlinson, "Five Great Monarchies," i, 579.

¶ Daniel v, 10; Xenophon, "Cyrop.," vii, 5, 15.

** Rawlinson, "Five Great Monarchies," iii, 236.

in the time of Christ that Corinthians were usually introduced on the stage in a state of intoxication.* Rome, at that age, as her own heathen historians have confessed, was a vortex into which all sin and shame (*cuncta atrocia aut pudenda*) † flowed together, so that every place was filled with vice and crime, (*omnia sceleribus ac vitiis plena sunt.*) ‡ The writings of Juvenal, Persius, Horace, and Petronius, show that the Roman Empire was full of drunkenness and debauchery. The prevalence of intemperance in Palestine is amply attested by the denunciations of wine in the Old Testament, and the fearful woes pronounced upon the drunkard and the drunkard-maker. Significant of the fact is the law of the rabbins, that on the Feast of Purim a man should "drink wine until he be drunk and fall asleep in his drunkenness." § The frequent condemnations of this degrading vice, both by Christ and his apostles, prove its prevalence in their immediate vicinity and age. So far, therefore, as intemperance is concerned there is no essential difference between our circumstances and Christ's. Nor is that difference found in the application of total abstinence as remedy for intemperance. That is by no means a modern discovery. Two thousand years before Christ it was enjoined upon the Egyptian priesthood. ‖ Centuries later, the Institutes of Menu required it of all officiating Brahmins.¶ In the "Pentalogue of Buddha" (B.C. 560) there ran this precept: "Thou shalt not drink any intoxicating liquor." ** The Lacedæmonians were at one period of their history total abstainers.†† In Palestine, before the time of Christ, the Nazarites (Num. vi, 1–4) and the Rechabites (Jer. xxv, 1–19) adopted total abstinence as the cardinal principle of their orders, and while he was upon the earth the Essenes in Judea and the Therapeutæ in Egypt made it the daily practice of their lives. But if the change of circumstances quoted in explanation of the use of wine by Christ, and in condemnation of its use in modern times, does not consist in the prevalence of drunkenness or in the practice of total

* Ælian, "Variæ Historiæ," iii, 15.
† Tacitus, "Ann.," xv, 44.
‡ Seneca, "De Irâ," ii, 8.
§ Hilkoth, "Megillah," ii, 5.
‖ Hieratic Papyri, let. xi.
¶ Jacolliot, "The Bible in India."
** Malcom, "Travels in the Burman Empire."
†† Athenæus, Banquet, Bohn's translation, vol. ii, p. 682.

abstinence, then it does not exist, and the argument which is based upon it is nugatory.

But even if it were proved that such a change had taken place, it would not alter the case or improve the argument, for that involves another and more serious fallacy. It estimates the motives, and measures the conduct, of Christ by the narrow limitations and imperfect moral standards of ordinary men. But he was not environed by any such conditions as theirs. There was nothing local or temporary in his character, his instructions, or his influence. He belonged to no age, since he lived for every age. His mode of governing his life was to furnish principles of conduct to men until the end of time. It was so ordered that all might find in him a safe and helpful example amid every variety of experience or stress of circumstance. Dr. Plumb asks us * to "picture the compassionate Jesus standing amid sixty thousand drunkards who are said to die in this land every year; see him moving among those who are to form that lost and ruined army in future years, who are now questioning whether to begin to drink or to leave all intoxicants forever alone, and then imagine, if you can, that as they are hesitating whether to take the fatal first step which will lead them on to their endless loss, the self-sacrificing Jesus, knowing this, would consent to tempt them to that step, and that he would do it because he was unwilling to give up the personal gratification of drinking wine." And he asks, "Can any thing much more shocking or irreverent, or more utterly opposed to the whole spirit of the suffering Saviour, be imagined than that?" Nothing *any* more shocking, etc., can be imagined, we admit. But to the inference which Dr. Plumb proceeds to draw from these premises we must enter a demurrer. "If the principles which governed the Saviour's life would keep him from doing this were he now here," he concludes "those principles should deter every disciple of Jesus from taking this heartless and self-indulgent course." We will not call this a *non-sequitur*, but it is not the natural and legitimate conclusion from the premises. That conclusion is this: If those principles "would keep him from doing this were he now here," they would equally have deterred him "from taking

* Essay before Ministerial Temperance Convention, Boston "Traveller," March 8, 1881.

this heartless and self-indulgent course" when on earth he was living and acting in omniscient comprehension of every temptation to which each soul of man would be exposed in all coming ages. For it is Dr. Plumb who emphatically asserts, "The Lord Jesus Christ before he came to the earth perfectly knew all coming history; he clearly foresaw every exigency that could ever arise; he planned his own earthly life in every smallest particular and with reference to all the long future." That settles on his own principles whether or not Christ in the first century abstained for the sake of the tempted of this nineteenth century. Christ does not demand of his disciples any stricter self-denial for the sake of others than he himself practiced on their account. For us to claim that he did not set the example, and then ourselves to abstain from any scruples whatever, is to profess to be in advance of Christ; it is for the servant to set himself above the Master; it is to cast reflections on the character and conduct of our blessed Lord. If he drank alcoholic beverages we may do the same. Not that we *must*, but we *may*. There can be no obligation to abstain which he would not have recognized and enforced by his own example. If he indulged, indulgence is innocent. If we must abstain because of our influence, his is infinitely greater. If he has sanctioned the habit of wine-drinking by his practice, that fact must outweigh every other in a controversy upon the subject. If the charge which is brought against him of being a wine-bibber be sustained, then we have no invulnerable argument with which to urge the duty of total abstinence. In answer to the soundest objection which we may bring against the use of intoxicating liquors, it will be sufficient for every man to cite the example of Christ, and to claim its sanction for his indulgence, provided it be kept within the limits of moderation. And intrenched behind such scriptural defenses it will be impossible to dislodge the drinking customs of society. The cause of temperance will receive a blow from which it can never recover. That cause will not prosper unless it is built upon the will and word of God. The doctrine of total abstinence will not command the obedience of men unless it comes to them with a "Thus saith the Lord." Every thing that is vital to this great issue is determined by Christ's position upon the question. With tremulous interest, therefore,

we proceed to inquire, *Was Jesus Christ a wine-bibber?* And let us consider

II. The Charge and its Authors.

1. What does the charge imply? It is all contained in the epithet "wine-bibber," which is so contemptuously applied to Christ. Webster defines the English term, "One who drinks much wine, a great drinker." Worcester defines, "One who drinks wine habitually or to excess, a tippler." The Greek term is *οἰνοπότης*. It is used only in this connection in the New Testament. The LXX used it to render the Hebrew סֹבְאֵי יָיִן, (*sovai-yayin*,) literally, "soakers of wine." (Prov. xxiii, 20.) It is also found in classic Greek, (Anacreon 72; Luc. Asin. 48; and Polybius xx, 8, 2.) In the version of Wycliffe (1380) it is rendered "drynker of wyne" in Matthew, and in Luke "drynkynge wiyn." Tyndale (1534) renders "drynker of wyne" in both Gospels. Beza translates *vini-potor*, "drinker of wine," in Matthew, and both Beza and the Vulgate *bibens vinum*, "drinking wine," in Luke. In the Greek, as in the other tongues, "drinker" has an intensive force indicating the habitual repetition of the act. It gives emphasis to the habit rather than to the effect of the habit. The use of the connected term *φάγος*, accurately rendered "gluttonous," marks this sense. The charge of being an *οἰνοπότης* did not necessarily imply that Jesus used wine for the purpose of stimulation rather than of nutrition, or that he drank stimulating wines to intoxication, although both may have been intended by the cavil. It does mean, however, that he used wine, whether intoxicating or not, customarily, and perhaps immoderately. And yet how much less such an accusation might imply than our nineteenth century conceptions of intemperance would suggest is indicated by a note of Dr. Gill on Deut. xxi, 20:* "According to the Mishna, a glutton and a drunkard is one that eats half a pound of flesh and drinks half a log of Italian wine—a quarter of a pint—which would be at this day reckoned very little by our grandsons of Bacchus, as Snickard observes, but in an age of severer discipline, in the tender candidates of temperance it was reckoned too much." And then he adds, "The Jews seem to refer to this when they charged Christ with being a glutton

* Quoted in "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. 57.

and a wine-bibber." In substance the epithet was very nearly equivalent to our modern designation of "moderate drinker."

2. Who made anciently this charge? The only clue we have to an answer is given in Christ's own words: "They say, (λέγουσι,) Behold, a man gluttonous and a wine-bibber," etc. "They say" is always untrustworthy authority. Candid men never accept its evidence. It is usually false, and oftentimes foully calumnious. The truth in any given instance is ordinarily to be reached only through an absolute reversal of its testimony. Mr. Patmore, in writing of the gifted William Hazlitt says*: "Precisely *because* he was the most original thinker of his day we heard him held up a mere waiter upon the intellectual wealth of his acquaintances—a mere sucker of the brains of Charles Lamb and Coleridge. Precisely *because* his face was pale and clear like marble, we saw him pointed out as the 'Pimpled Hazlitt.' *Precisely because he never tasted any thing but water, we saw him held up as an habitual gin-drinker and sot.*" Hazlitt himself said: "If I had been a dram-drinker the world would have called me a milksop." It would, undoubtedly, have done the same with Jesus. But, it is said, it is Christ himself who makes us acquainted with this charge. "He tells us that his drinking wine brought on him a railing accusation of the men of his generation," says Dr. Moore.† But this was not a confession of judgment on his part. On the contrary, his language very clearly implied that his drinking, whatever it was—for he did not say "drinking *wine*," as Dr. Moore affirms—furnished no ground for the charge of being a "wine-bibber." It is true he attempted no explicit denial of the allegation; but neither did he deny that John had a devil, (Matt. xi, 18,) or that he was himself also a glutton and a sensualist. For this last accusation was contained in the assertion that he was "a friend of publicans and sinners." But why did he make no denial of these charges? Simply because he knew none was called for. His enemies perfectly well understood that they were false. They knew that he was not a wine-bibber in any such sense as the word was intended to convey. But they were bent on destroying his influence as a moral teacher and religious reformer.

* "My Friends and Acquaintances," London, 1854, vol. ii, p. 348.

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 88.

They judged that they could do this most effectively by assailing his private character. So they fabricated and tried to fasten upon him the charge of reckless self-indulgence. But to all their calumnies he deigned only the simple answer, "Wisdom is justified by her children." (Matt. xi, 19.) My life and labors are my sufficient vindication. Those who know me need no denial from my lips; those who hate me would receive none.

The fact that his enemies put gluttony, and sensuality, and wine-bibbing on a par proves the estimation in which the latter habit was held. It was reckoned a disgrace in that day as it is in our own. And yet on the ground of these unscrupulous slanders we are asked to believe that Christ exposed himself to that disgrace. It would be just as reasonable to regard him as a blasphemer, because he was charged with that offense before the high court of Caiaphas. It is not improbable that he who came "to seek and to save that which was lost" sometimes found himself in the company of those who drank immoderately, and possibly to intoxication. But to argue from such a circumstance that he in like manner indulged would compel the further admission that he yielded to gluttony and sensuality. It is claimed,* however, that "his example as a user of wine is expressly contrasted by himself with the example of his forerunner, John the Baptist, who, being a Nazarite, was an abstainer from wine." But this argument proves too much, if it proves any thing. If Jesus must have partaken of all kinds of wine, fermented and unfermented, because John abstained from all kinds, then, by parity of reasoning, he must have indulged in all the viands of Judea, since John ate only "locusts and wild honey." But the contrast in this case is neither universal nor specific, but general. John, as a Nazarite, was vowed to abstinence from all products of the vine, whether solid or liquid, "from the kernels even to the husk." (Num. vi, 1–4.) Jesus was not a Nazarite, and was under no such obligation. He was perfectly free to satisfy his natural wants with any of "the good creatures" which his Father in heaven had provided. And in fact we know that he did partake of "the fruit of the vine." (Matt. xxvi, 29, etc.) But that in any instance this was an intoxicating article is a wholly unwarranted and gratuitous assumption.

* Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 86.

We must now enlarge the sphere of our inquiry, and examine the grounds on which, at the present day, it is claimed that the example of Christ sanctions the use of alcoholic beverages. What are the alleged facts in support of which testimony is offered? Careful analysis reduce the specifications of the charge to three: (1) Jesus Christ made fermented wine; (2) Jesus Christ commended fermented wine; (3) Jesus Christ used fermented wine.

Before we enter upon the detailed examination of these several specifications, some

III. Preliminary Discussion

will be necessary concerning an assumption which is common to them all, and which, if it be conceded, settles the whole question at once and affirmatively. It is the assumption that there was and is but one kind of wine, and that fermented, and, when taken in sufficient quantities, intoxicating. Chancellor Crosby says,* "There is not a chemist or a classical scholar in the world who would dare risk his reputation on the assertion that there was ever an unfermented wine in common use, knowing well, that *must* preserved from fermentation is called wine only by a kind of courtesy (as the lump of unbaked dough might be called 'bread,') and that this could never, in the nature of things be a common drink." Prof. Bumstead makes similar assertions;† declaring that the theory "of an unfermented wine has failed to commend itself to the scholarship of the world.‡" And Dr. Moore remarks,§ "The history of the doctrine of unfermented Bible wine cannot be carried back beyond a few decades; and this fact furnishes a *préjugé légitime* against it." As to the argument from scholarship, it is sufficient to say, there are many and eminent authorities, inferior to none and superior to most in scholarship, who do un-

* "A Calm View of the Temperance Question."

† For instance, he speaks ("Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 109) of "the weakness . . . that has driven so many of *the less scholarly* advocates of the doctrine [total abstinence] to adopt the theory that Christ employed an unfermented wine." And again (*ibid.*, p. 113) he alludes to "*the fiction* that Christ made and used an unfermented wine."

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 115.

§ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 81.

hesitatingly affirm the existence and use of unfermented wine in Bible lands and times. They have as complete access to the evidence in the case, and are as competent judges of its validity and bearing, as either of the authors we have quoted or as any of the authorities whom they have cited. We need only mention Moses Stuart,* Eliphalet Nott,† Alonzo Potter, George Bush,‡ Albert Barnes, § William M. Jacobus,‖ Tayler Lewis,¶ George W. Samson,** F. R. Lees, †† Norman Kerr,‡‡ and Canon Farrar.§§ As to the *préjugé légitime*, this is not the first instance in which it has been appealed to for the sanction of error. There has rarely ever been a bad cause in whose support it was not invoked. The almost universal interpretation of the Bible in defense of the doctrine of passive obedience was pronounced a *préjugé légitime* against the right of resistance to tyrants in Charles the Second's day. That interpretation, however, has gone for very little since the Revolution of 1688. The almost universal interpretation of the Bible in support of the system of human slavery was deemed a *préjugé légitime* against the right and duty of abolition, a quarter of a century ago. That interpretation, also, has been worth very little since the crisis of civil war and the act of emancipation. But the principle upon which the non-jurors argued the divine obligation of passive obedience, and the slaveholders defended the divine authority of human chattelism,

* "It was a very common thing to preserve wine in an unfermented state, and when thus preserved it was regarded as of a higher and better quality than any other."—Letter to Dr. Nott, New York, 1848, p. 44.

† "That unintoxicating wines existed from remote antiquity, and were held in high esteem by the wise and the good, there can be no reasonable doubt. The evidence is unequivocal and plenary."—"Lecture on Temperance," London edition, p. 85.

‡ The language of both of these distinguished men to E. C. Delevan, Esq., on the subject was, "You have the whole ground."—"The Enquirer," Aug., 1869.

§ "The wine of Judea was the pure juice of the grape without any mixture of alcohol, and commonly weak and harmless."—"Commentary on John ii, 10."

‖ "All who know of the wines then used, will understand the unfermented juice of the grape."—"Commentary on John ii, 10."

¶ Wine "simply meant the liquid that came from pressing the grape. It was not fermenting fluid, but grape juice."—"The Advance," Dec. 24, 1874.

** "Divine Law as to Wines," *passim*.

†† "Wines, Ancient and Modern," *passim*. ‡‡ "Unfermented Wine a Fact."

§§ "Wine means primarily the juice, and often, as I believe, the unfermented juice, of the grape.—"Talks on Temperance," p. 41.

is precisely the same as that now employed in upholding the theory of a divine sanction for intoxicating wine. The old lesson must once more be learned, that a traditional interpretation of Scripture is not conclusive proof of any doctrine, but is often an obscuration of the truth of God. It is needful, therefore, to "pray against that bias which, by importing its own foregone conclusions into the word of Scripture, and, by refusing to acknowledge what makes against its own *prejudices*, has proved the greatest hinderance to all fair interpretation, and has tended, more than anything else in the world, to check the free course of divine truth." * In every age the Lord has some new light to break forth out of his Holy Word,† and in the next generation we may look to see it break as clearly on the duty of total abstinence as we have seen it shine in the generation just passing on the right of human freedom.

Without attempting any further appeal to authority in this case, we will proceed to examine as carefully and candidly as possible the evidence we have of

1. *The existence and use of unfermented wine in ancient times.*

(1.) And the first is found in the references both of Greek and Roman writers to wine which they declared would not intoxicate. For example, Aristotle ("Meteorologica," iv, 9,) says of the sweet wine of his day, (*οἶνος ὁ γλυκύς*) that it did not intoxicate, (*οὐ μεθύσκει*). And Athenæus ("Banquet," ii, 24,) makes a similar statement. Prof. Bumstead says ‡ that this wine was fermented and called sweet only "from the presence of considerable untransformed sugar." Dr. William Smith says § that it signified "wine positively sweet." It may have included wine which had undergone some degree of fermentation, but in general it was free from intoxicating properties, as the authorities just quoted indicate. This was probably true of the *vinum dulce* of the Romans, described by Columella, ("De Re Rustica," xii, 27.) The same author ("De Re Rustica," iii, 2,) and Pliny also, ("Natural History," xiv, 2,) mention a wine made from the grape, *inerticula*, (literally, "that

* Bishop Ellicott in "Aids to Faith," p. 421.

† Robinson's "Address to Pilgrim Fathers."

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 62.

§ "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," art. "Vinum."

produces no effect,") which Pliny says did not cause intoxication — *temulentiam non facit.* Dr. Moore attempts to break the force of this testimony by saying * that "it is not of the wine, but the grape, that Pliny says it alone does not cause intoxication. And it is not of the wine, but of the grape, that he tells us that we ought to call it sober (*sobriam*)." But any lexicon would tell him that these terms were applied to the grape because they describe the qualities of the wine made from it. So Columella distinctly states, (iii, 2,) *unde etiam nomen traxit.* Still, Dr. Moore insists † that the wine made from this grape "was certainly fermented," because, forsooth, "Pliny tells us that it could grow old, which must or unfermented grape juice could not." This is simply not so, as we shall see. Against both these statements of Aristotle and Pliny, and all similar ones, the objection is brought that it is only in "the comparative sense, and not absolutely," that their testimony as to the non-intoxicating character of certain wines is to be taken.‡ Prof. Bumstead compares them § "with similar statements in regard to lager beer and other beverages, which, it is well known, contain alcohol and can intoxicate if a sufficient quantity be taken. Such statements are popular and not scientific." The standard of comparison in this case, however, is the distilled and fortified liquors of modern times. But a very different standard was in the minds of the ancient authors whom we quote. They knew nothing of these stronger drinks. Distillation was not discovered until the eleventh or twelfth century of the Christian era, ‖ and the wines of antiquity were, in general, of small alcoholic power. In fact all wines, until within the last hundred years, were comparatively weak. The analyses of Neumann in the last century have determined this point.¶ They show that the very strongest of mediæval wines contained only about twelve per cent. of spirit, and the average scarcely more than six. The distilled and fortified drinks of to-day average from twenty-five to fifty per cent. of alcohol. A wine which, in comparison with the ordinary standards of antiquity was pronounced weak, must have been devoid of any intoxicating power.

* "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 105. † *Ibid.*
‡ *Ibid.*, p. 106. § "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 61.
‖ Richardson, "Cantor Lectures on Alcohol," p. 27. ¶ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

(2.) But, however that may be, the objection has no pertinency when the pure juice of the grape freshly expressed is drank. This is the first and simplest product of the grape, and would naturally be the earliest artificial beverage.* It is drank to this day by the peasants in wine-bearing districts.† Its use is clearly traceable as far back as the times of the Pharaohs. This custom is certainly indicated in the record of the chief butler's dream, (Gen. xl, 11:) "And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes and pressed it into Pharaoh's cup, and I took the cup and gave it into Pharaoh's hand." The objection that dreams are "not very good historical evidence,‡ is not well taken. The falsity of a dream to real life lies not in its separate images, but in their incongruous relations. The argument for "the unreliability of this particular dream," from the rapidity with which the several events transpire, is answered by the fact that they are events such as actually do occur, and that, too, in precisely the order set forth in the dream. The marvelous fidelity of both the dreams of the chief baker and the chief butler is proved by "so trifling a detail as the bake-meats being said to have been carried on the head," which "is true to Egyptian life, for, while the monuments show that men carried their burdens less often on their head than otherwise, bakers are a marked exception."§ The literal accuracy of the dream of the chief butler is maintained by Tuch,‖ Michaelis,¶ Rosenmüller,** Henry,†† Clarke,†† Lowth,†† and Stuart.‡‡ But without relying upon the authority of these scholars, or making any "prosaic"§§ appeal to the picture exhumed at Pompeii representing Bacchus squeezing grape clusters into a wine-cup, or resting our case on the probability that Herodotus refers to the freshly expressed juice of the grape by ἀμπέλινος οἶνος,‖‖ we are able to cite irrefragable proof that the chief butler's dream pictured a literally correct trait of Egyptian

* *Vide* Barry, "Wines of the Ancients," London, 1775, p. 27.
† *Vide* "Life of Dr. Duff," i, 392; Kerr, "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 39.
‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 76.
§ Geikie, "Hours With the Bible," p. 467.
‖ "Com. zur Gen.," sec. 513. ¶ "Mosaic Laws," iii, 120.
** "Biblische Alterthumskunde," iv, 219. †† Com. *in loco.*
‡‡ "Essay on Prize Question Respecting the Use of Spirituous Liquors," p. 31.
§§ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 77.
‖‖ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 112.

life. Dr. Ebers has recently discovered, on the walls of the temple of Edfu, a picture of the king, standing cup in hand, while underneath is the inscription: "They press grapes into the water and the king drinks." *

(3.) Again, it is without doubt or question that both the Greeks and the Romans had a beverage which consisted of the pure, unfermented juice of the grape, whether freshly expressed or carefully preserved does not just yet concern us. This is referred to frequently by the classic authors of both tongues, and is conceded on every hand by classical scholars of every shade of opinion. For confirmation of this statement we need only refer the reader to Dr. Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," article "Vinum;" or to his "Dictionary of the Bible," article "Wine." The Greek beverage was known by the name of γλεῦκος. It is not affirmed or admitted that it was not known under other names. That point is postponed. It was known by this title. Aristotle frequently mentions it, ("Meteorologica," *passim.*) Suidas, in his lexicon, defines it τὸ ἀποστάλαγμα τῆς σταφυλῆς πρὶν πατηθῆ, "the droppings from the cluster before it is trodden." Josephus, ("Jud. Antiq.," ii, 52,) applies the term to the wine represented as being pressed out of the bunch of grapes by the chief butler into Pharaoh's cup. Prof. Bumstead admits † that "it was sweet from lack of vinous fermentation," and again he calls it ‡ "the newly expressed juice of the grape." From the supposed necessities of exegesis in the New Testament (Acts ii, 13) Alford, § followed by Dr. Moore, ‖ attempts to widen its meaning to include a certain amount of intoxicating property. But this is contrary to classic usage. The corresponding Latin term, with a precisely similar signification, is *mustum.* It designates a pure and unfermented beverage made of the grape. It is so explained by all the authorities.¶ It is so used by all the Roman rustic writers, Cato, Columella, Varro, and by Pliny. Indeed, so strongly do these authors insist upon its special characteristic of freedom from fermentation—Pliny, *e. g.*, saying, ("Natural History," xiv, 9,) "*Sic*

* Eber, "Durch Gosen zum Sinai," p. 480. Geikie, "Hours With the Bible," p. 465.
† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 62. ‡ *Ibid.*, p. 81.
§ Com. *in loco.* ‖ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 110.
¶ *Vide* "Harper's Latin Dictionary," 1880, *in loco.*

—*scil. fervere—appellant musti in vina transitum*"—that Dr. Moore and others declare, "this distinguishes must from wine, the differentia consisting in its having undergone fermentation." * This much, therefore, is settled without controversy. The people of antiquity did have a form of unfermented grape juice which they used as a beverage.

We advance now another step, and consider the fact that

(4.) The ancients were familiar with the methods by which fermentation † is prevented. Grape juice contains two leading ingredients, sugar and albumen or gluten. The former is composed of the three chemical elements, carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen; the latter is composed of four elements, carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen. Nitrogen in all of its compounds is an unstable element, disposed to disengage itself from one union and to seek another. Thus it hastens the decay of vital organisms and tends to the formation of new substances. The decay of the gluten in the grape juice affords the necessary conditions for the reception and growth of the yeast germs which are floating every-where in the air, and in the presence of which the sugar is gradually converted into alcohol, while carbonic acid escapes from the liquid.‡ Now there are four or more different methods by which this process may be prevented and the grape juice preserved fresh and unfermented.

a. The gluten may be separated from the other elements. This substance, enclosed in minute cells, is located in the lining of the skin and in the envelope of the seed of the grape. By careful manipulation the flowing juice in which the sugar is concentrated may be released without disturbing the fermentable pulp. This principle was understood by the ancients and applied in practice. They had a drink which they called *πρόχυμα*, ("Geoponica," vi, 16,) or *protropum*, ("Natural History," xiv, 9.) Of this article Pliny says: *Ita appellatur a quibusdam mustum sponte defluens, antequam calcentur uvae*, "So the must which flows out of its own accord, before the grapes are trodden, is called by some." Such a liquid, oozing

* "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 101.

† We use the term throughout this work for what is strictly "vinous" fermentation, unless the contrary fact is indicated.

‡ Nichols, "Manual of Chemistry," pp. 143, 181. Schützenberger, "Fermentation," p. 18.

spontaneously from the skin of the grape, and composed almost entirely of the saccharine portion of the juice, could not have been quick to ferment. But Dr. Moore says,* "Pliny expressly tells us that it was allowed to ferment," (*Hoc protinus diffusum lagenis suis defervescere passi.* N. H., xiv, 9.) This does not mean, however, that fermentation was essential to *protropum*—it is called that before any thing is said about its undergoing that process—but that *protropum* was allowed to ferment, after which it was known under another name. The value of careful handling of the grapes to prevent the escape of the gluten is indicated by several items in the directions and descriptions of Roman writers on wines. They frequently insist that the grapes shall be trodden by foot, (*calco*,) rather than crushed by the heavy beam, (*prelo*.) Thus Columella, (xii, 37,) in a recipe for making *vinum dulce*, directs that the grapes shall be trodden, (*calcato*,) and the juice kept free of every thing which has come through the press, *quod habeat ex tortivo*. And Pliny, in describing the process of making *passum*, says, (xiv, 9,) *Tunsasque* [*uvas*] *leniter exprimunt*, "They *gently* crush and press the clusters." The juice which was obtained from this careful pressure, before the grapes had been fully trodden, was known as the *mustum lixivium*, and was preserved for drinking in its unfermented state. ("Geopon.," vi, 16; Columella, xii, 41.)†

When the gluten has been expressed with the saccharine juice it is still possible to effect a separation. By means of filters the fermentable pulp may be strained out. This is accomplished with complete success by modern apparatus.‡ It is not certain that the ancients possessed equally effective methods. It is probable, however, that during the whole history of wine-making attempts in this direction have been made. It was, doubtless, with this end, in part at least, in view that the early Egyptians employed the presses which are represented on the tomb-walls of Beni-Hassan. "The most simple consisted merely of a bag in which the grapes were put, and squeezed by means of two poles turning in contrary directions; a vase being placed

* "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 104.

† *Vide* Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," art. "Vinum."

‡ *Vide* "Encyclopædia Britannica," Ninth Ed., art. "Fermentation." Also, Ure's "Dictionary of Arts, Manufactures and Mines," i, 697.

below to receive the falling juice."* There was another press, nearly on the same principle, but more elaborately constructed. Both strained as well as expressed the juice of the grapes. The Latin writers refer to the use of strainers or filters in the preparation of wines. The *cola* or cloth sacks, according to Virgil, ("Georg.," ii, 240–245,) were a regular accompaniment of the *prelum* or wine-press. Pliny says, (xxiii, 24,) *Utillissimum* (*vinum*) *omnibus sacco viribus. Meminerimus succum esse qui fervendo vires musto sibi fecerit.* "The most useful wine for everybody is that whose strength is destroyed by the filter. We must remember that there is a juice which, by the fermenting of the must, has made to itself strength." That in this instance Pliny refers to the use of the filter to destroy—for such is the force of *frango*—the strength of wine in which fermentation had already begun, is admitted. But it does not follow that because it was used for this purpose it was applied to no other. The passage we have quoted indicates its employment to separate the *succum*, which may refer to the gluten or fermentable substance, as well as to strain out the *fœces*. It is of some significance in this connection that the Delphin notes on Horace i, xi, where the expression *vina liques*, "filter your wines," occurs, say, *Veteres nempe mustum priusquam ferbuisset per saccum toties colabunt*, etc. "For of a truth the ancients were in the habit of straining *the must* repeatedly through a filter *before it had fermented.*" It is certain that wines were filtered to deprive them of their intoxicating power. Pliny says, (xiv, 22,) *Ut plus capiamus* (*vini*) *sacco frangimur vires.* "That we may drink the more wine we destroy its strength by the filter." So Plutarch, ("Sympos.," viii, 7,) after speaking of the process of filtration in very much the same words as Pliny; and telling us that *it was frequently repeated*, says, "The strength being thus withdrawn, the wine neither inflames the head nor infests the mind and the passions."

But this is not the only method by which fermentation may be prevented.

b. The expulsion of the moisture is equally efficacious. Says Prof. Ditmar,† "No fermentable subject will ferment except

* Wilkinson, "Ancient Egyptians," i, 45.

† "Encyclopædia Britannica," Ninth Ed., art. "Fermentation."

in the presence of water, and unless it be kept by means of that water in contact with some specific ferment." There are two ways in which the removal of the water is effected. The grape may be dried before the skin is broken, and, preserved in that condition, after any lapse of time it will afford material for an unfermented beverage. By the simple soaking of dried grapes or raisins in water many churches provide the wine used in celebrating the Lord's Supper. Rev. Henry Homes, American missionary at Constantinople, informs us,* that in Asia Minor and Syria the grapes are carefully dried, and then the "raisins are boiled for two or three hours to make a refreshing drink, called 'sweet water,' (*khosab*, literally, boiled water.) It has no intoxicating qualities, for the proportion of the water is large, and it is drunk only when freshly made." Mr. Edward W. Lane, the distinguished Arabic scholar and traveler, says:† "*Nebeedh*, prepared from raisins, is commonly sold in Arab towns under the name of *zebeeb*. I have often drunk it in Cairo, but never could perceive that it was in the slightest degree fermented." This raisin wine was the Roman *passum*, (from *pando*, so called because the grapes were *spread out* to dry.) Columella, (xii, 39,) Varro, (Ap. Non. 551, 27,) and Pliny (xiv, 9) describe this kind of wine. Dr. Moore quotes Columella, (xii, 39,)‡ "*Deinde post* xx. *vel* xxx. *dies cum deferbuerit in alia deliquare*," etc., to prove that it was fermented. But in this case, as in that of *protropum*, already mentioned, the statement merely indicates the fact that *passum* was sometimes allowed to ferment, not that fermentation was essential to its being *passum*. On the contrary, Columella says, (xii, 39,) *Prelo* [*uvas*] *premere passumque tollere*, "Squeeze the grapes in a press and take away the *passum*." It was *passum* immediately, before any fermentation could have taken place.

The most common and successful method, however, of expelling the moisture is by inspissating the fresh juice. By boiling, the water is evaporated and fermentation prevented. The people of Syria to this day boil down the simple grape juice "until it is reduced to one fourth of the quantity put in."§

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," May, 1848.

† Notes to the "Arabian Nights," vol. i, p. 215.

‡ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 105.

§ Rev. Mr. Homes in "Bibliotheca Sacra," May, 1848.

The product known as "*nardenk* is used as a syrup for a beverage, one part of the syrup to from six to fifteen parts of water. It ordinarily has not a particle of intoxicating quality." "In the manner of making and preserving it, it seems to correspond with the recipes and descriptions of certain drinks included by some of the ancients under the appellation wine." The modern Italian wine known as *vino cotto* is boiled, and has been found by chemical analysis not to contain a particle of alcohol. When drank it requires weakening with water.* The Arabic *dibs* is the product of boiling grape juice.† Archbishop Potter (A. D. 1674) says:‡ "The Lacedæmonians used to boil their wines upon the fire till the fifth part was consumed; then after four years were expired began to drink them." He cites as authority for this statement Democritus, a Greek philosopher, and Palladius, a Greek physician. Virgil ("Georg." i, 295) pictures the housewife as

> "—— dulcis musti vulcano decoquit humorem,
> Et foliis undam tepidi despumat aheni."

"She boils down by the fire the moisture of the sweet must, and skims off with leaves the wavy froth of the simmering caldron." Varro, Columella, and Pliny describe the boiled wines of the Romans, and give them different names according to the extent to which evaporation was carried; as, *carenum*, one third; *defrutum*, one half, (so Pliny; but Columella and Varro say one third;) *sapa*, two thirds.§ These were distinguished by the Greeks under the general names of ἕψημα, γλύξις, and σίραιον. Prof. Bumstead and Dr. Moore both dismiss them with the general denial that they were "ever used or designated" as "wines." As regards the latter point we shall see further on. As regards the former, it is true Pliny says, (xiv, 9,) *Omnia in adulterium mellis excogitata*, "They were all contrived for the adulteration of honey." But he does not say they were limited to that use. We know they were not. They were employed to give body to lighter and fermented wines, (Col. xii, 39,) and they also "entered as ingredients into many drinks."‖ It is probable that they were themselves simply

* Van Buren, "Gospel Temperance," p. 105, note.
† Van Lennep, "Bible Lands," p. 120.
‡ "Grecian Antiquities," Edinburgh, 1818, ii, 360.
§ Smith, "Greek and Roman Antiquities," art. "Vinum." ‖ *Ibid.*

diluted and drank like the Syrian *nardenk*, the Persian *duschab*,* the Italian *vino cotto*, and the French *vin cuit*. We know that the practice of diluting wines was universal in ancient times. Rome had a public establishment for this purpose, known as the Thermopolium. It furnished its patrons hot water and cold; the hot, according to Sir Edward Barry,† to dissolve their more inspissated and old wines. This process was made necessary, not only by the strength, but quite as much by the sweetness and consistency of the wines. This is the key, we think, to the interpretation of the oft-quoted passage from the "Odyssey," (ix, 196 f.,) concerning the wine which the priest, Maron, gave to Ulysses. Prof. Bumstead says,‡ "It was *so strong* that a single cup was mingled with twenty of water." Homer says nothing of the sort. He calls the wine (l. 205) *ἡδὺν, ἀκράσιον, θεῖον ποτόν*, "a sweet, unadulterated, divine drink;" (l. 346,) *μέλας οἶνος*, "black wine;" (l. 360,) *αἴθοπα οἶνον*, "dark wine." And he says of Polyphemus, to whom Ulysses offered it, (l. 208:)

> *Τὸν δ' ὅτε πίνοιεν μελιηδέα οἶνον ἐρυθρόν,*
> *Ἓν δέπας ἐμπλήσας, ὕδατος ἀνὰ εἴκοσι μέτρα*
> *Χεῦ'.*

"But when he drank this honey-sweet, red wine, filling up one cup, he poured in it up to twenty measures of water." There is not a word here or elsewhere about its strength, but every one of the adjectives employed indicates just such excessive sweetness, thick consistency, and dark color as would be produced by heat. The celebrated Opimian wine, which Pliny tells us (xiv, 4) had in his day, two centuries after it was made, the consistency of honey, may have been an inspissated article. Such, very likely, was the Tæniotic wine of Egypt, which Athenæus, in his "Banquet," (i, 25,) tells us had such a degree of richness (*λίπαρον*) that "it is dissolved little by little when it is mixed with water, just as the Attic honey is dissolved by the same process." A further fact in this connection calls for

* "The Persians sometimes boil the duschab (a syrup of sweet wine or must) so long that they reduce it to a paste for the convenience of travelers, who lay in a stock of it for the journey, cutting it with a knife, and diluting it with water to serve as a drink."—"Travels in Muscovy, Tartary, and Persia," by Adam Olearius, Embassador for Holstein, by Wicquefort, lib. v, 802.

† "Observations on the Wines of the Ancients," London, 1775, p. 165.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 62.

notice. As grape juice boils at 212 deg. Fahr., and alcohol evaporates at 172 deg. Fahr., it is evident that, if there were any in the liquid, boiling would expel it.

c. Fermentation may also be prevented by the exclusion of the air from the grape juice. The researches of Pasteur and Hallier* have established the fact that the spores or germs of the yeast plant are introduced by the action of ordinary air into the fermentable fluid. So that if the grape juice be inclosed in some air-tight receptacle fermentation will not occur. The ancients were acquainted with this fact, if they did not understand its theory. It was their custom to take the earthen *amphora*, Greek κέραμος, carefully line it with pitch, and having filled it with the fresh juice, seal it and then sink it in water or bury it in the earth. In this way it was preserved from the access and action of the atmosphere. We find directions for this process in Cato, ("De Re Rustica," 120,) Columella, (xii, 39,) Pliny, (xiv, 9,) Plutarch, (Q. N., 26) and the "Geoponica," (vi, 16.) Columella introduces his directions as follows: *Mustum ut semper dulce tanquam recens permaneat sic facito*, "That your must may be always sweet as when it is new, thus proceed." He closes by saying, *Sic usque in annum dulce permanebit*, "It will thus remain sweet for a whole year." Dr. Moore is at some pains to point out† that this remark indicates the sense in which *semper* is to be understood, both in this passage and the one soon to be quoted from Pliny, and intimates that must could be preserved in this way only for a year. If it were so, that would be all that was required. Each vintage would yield a fresh supply. But it is not so. The method that would preserve it one year would keep it ten, twenty, or any number of years.

This process is so closely connected with another, as indicated by the passages to which we have referred, that we will turn to it without further illustration of the one under consideration.

d. Fermentation may be prevented by keeping the grape juice at a temperature below 40 deg. Fahr. Fermentation is possible only at a temperature between this and 86 deg. Fahr. Above the latter point the acetous surplants the vinous process; below the former point the ferment is inoperative. Any thing,

* Appleton's "American Cyclopædia," art. "Fermentation."

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 104.

therefore, that reduces the temperature to 40 deg. or below will keep the liquid fresh and sweet. Pliny, in speaking of the Greek, *ἀεὶ γλεῦκος*, Latin, *semper mustum*, says, (xiv, 9,) *Mergunt e lacu protinus in aqua cados, donec bruma transeat, et consuetudo fiat algendi*, "Immediately after the casks have been filled from the vat they sink them in water, until the winter solstice is past, and the habit of being cold is created." Thus, by a combination of the two last-mentioned methods, the exclusion of the air and the reduction of the temperature, fermentation is prevented and the grape juice kept fresh.

e. It remains to speak of one other method of preventing fermentation, namely, by sulphur fumigation. This absorbs the oxygen of the air and arrests the action of the nitrogenous element in the gluten. The process is employed by wine growers in Europe at the present day in preserving unfermented wine.* It is well-known that the ancients used sulphur, pumice-stone, the yelk of eggs, and other substances containing sulphur, in the preparation of their vines. Pliny in a chapter (xiv, 20) devoted to recipes for preserving wine *in primo fervore*, "in the first stages of ferment," says: *Cato facit et sulpuris mentionem*, "Cato also makes mention of sulphur." Horace doubtless alludes to this practice, (Car. iii, 8 :)

> "Hic dies, anno redeunte, festus,
> Corticem adstrictum pice dimovebit,
> Amphoræ fumum bibere institutæ.
> Consule Tullo."

"This day, sacred in the revolving year, shall remove the cork fastened with pitch from the amphora which was set to fumigate in the consulship of Tullius." The next stanza informs us that this fumigated wine might be drank to the extent of a hundred cups without exciting passion or clamor. "When the Mishna forbids *smoked* wines from being used in offerings, (Manachoth, viii, 6, *et comment.*,) it has chiefly reference to the Roman practice of fumigating them with sulphur, the vapor of which absorbed the oxygen of the air and thus arrested the fermentation."†

(5.) We have thus far been considering the thing itself without much regard to the name by which it was called. We

* Kerr, "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 21.

† Kitto, "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature," art. "Wine."

have seen that there was and is such a beverage as the unfermented juice of the grape, that it was used as freshly expressed and when carefully preserved. That it was a common drink is amply attested by the frequent references to it in the writings of almost every ancient author, among both the Greeks and the Romans, in all ages of their history, from the earliest to the latest. It is mentioned not only by specialists, but by writers on general topics, historians, dramatists, moralists, and poets. The inference is natural that it was every-where recognized and used as a beverage. But the claim is set up that the unfermented juice of the grape was never known as wine. How that may be in the case of the Hebrews is reserved for separate consideration. Whatever was the classical usage we propose now to ascertain. The position taken is, that *wine meant always the fermented juice of the grape.* But the fallacy of such a proposition appears from these facts:

a. The fermented juice of the grape was not always called *wine.* Pliny, in referring to the Roman custom of forbidding the use of intoxicating wine to women, says (xiv, 13) in Cato's day kinsmen kissed the women when they met them to see if their breath smelled of *temetum;* and adds, *Hoc tum nomen vino erat,* "At that time this was the name for wine." Like this is the change in modern Greek by which wine is called *κρασί,* literally, *the mixed,* instead of the more classical *οἶνος.*

b. The term "wine" is used without any reference whatever to the *grape.* Herodotus calls beer made from barley (ii, 77) *οἶνος κριθέων,* and palm toddy (ii, 86) *οἶνος φοινικήϊος.* Xenophon also speaks of *οἶνος φοινίκων,* (Anab., ii, 3, 14,) and Dioscorides (Mat. Med., v, 40,) mentions *φοινικίτης οἶνος.* Herodotus (iv, 177) calls a drink made from the lotus plant *οἶνος.* Pliny says, (xiii, 5:) *E myxis in Ægypto et vina fiunt,* "Wines also were made from figs in Egypt."

c. Wine did not always mean the *juice* of the grape. The Greek *οἶνος,* (ancient, *Foῖνος,*) Latin, *vin-um,* (ancient, *vain-om,*) Gothic, *vein,* Armenian, *gin-i,* (for *gwin-i,*) German, *wein,* and English, *wine,* according to the best etymologists,* are either derived from or have a common origin with the Hebrew יַיִן

* Relations of the Aryan and Semitic Languages, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 142; Fürst, "Lexicon," *sub* יַיִן; Renan, "Lang. Sem.," i, 207.

yayin. This term, as we shall soon see, is used in at least two instances for the grape itself. The cognate Arabic term for wine means literally, "dark-colored grapes," and the Ethiopian term, "a vineyard." Similarly we find that the most ancient name for the vine among the Greeks was *οἴνη*, (Hesiod, Op. 572,*) and even after the introduction of *ἄμπελος* it retained its place, for example, in Euripides. Josephus enumerates (Bel. Jud. vii, 8, 4) among the stores in the fortress of Massada, corn, (*σῖτος*,) wine, (*οἶνος*,) oil, (*ἔλαιον*,) pulse and dates. He calls them *τοῦς κάρπους*, and by the terms wine and oil undoubtedly designates grapes and olives. We find the Latin *vinum* used for grapes, (*vinum pendens*, Cato, 147,) and for the vine, (*locus optimus vino*, Varro, i, 25.)

d. Wine did not always mean the *fermented* juice of the grape. The Greek writers frequently apply *οἶνος* to the juice of the grape before fermentation was possible. Æschylus (Agam. 939, 940) describes Zeus as creating *οἶνον* within the green grape, *ἀπ' ὄμφακος*. Anacreon (Ode 48) speaks of *τὸν οἶνον πεπηδημένον ὀπώραις ἐπὶ κλημάτων*, "the wine imprisoned in the fruit on the stems." Nicander of Colophon says,† *δεπάεσσιν Οἰνεὺς δ' ἐν κοίλοισιν ἀποθλίψας οἶνον ἔκλησε*, "And Æneas having squeezed (the juice) into hollow cups called it wine." Proclus, (A. D. 412,) who annotated the "Works and Days" of Hesiod, in his comment on line 611, explains the process of treading the grapes and "treading out the wine," *ἐκθλίβοντες τὸν οἶνον.*

e. The unintoxicating and unfermented juice of the grape was called wine. The beverages which Aristotle and Pliny said do not intoxicate were respectively designated as *οἶνος* ("Meteorologica," iv, 9) and *vinum* ("Natural History," xiv, 2.) *Γλεῦκος* and *mustum* were wine and were so named. Aristotle, speaking in the terms of the most exact science of his age, says, ("Meteorologica," iv, 7:) *οἶνος γάρ τις καὶ πήγνυται καὶ ἕψεται, οἷον τὸ γλεῦκος*, "For some *wine*, such as *gleukos*, is both congealed and evaporated." This is decisive of the fact that *gleukos* was wine, and was recognized scientifically as such. Cato, in giving instructions for making hellebore wine, says, ("De Re Rustica," 115:) *In vinum mustum veratri atri manipulum conjicito in amphoram*, "Throw a handful of black hellebore into *must wine* in an amphora." This settles the significance of

* *Vide* Athenæus, "Banquet," i, 1. † *Ibid*, ii, 1.

mustum. It first appears in the age of Cato (200 B. C.) as an adjective signifying "fresh," "new," "sweet," or "young," and is applied to *agna*, ewe lamb, (Cato, ap. Prisc., 711,) and to *mala*, apples, (Cato, "De Re Rustica," 73,) as well as to *vinum*. But in the latter case it became so identified with its noun that the latter was gradually dropped or absorbed, and the adjective became substantive in use and force. *Mustum*, therefore, always implies *vinum*, and means unfermented wine.* This is the explanation of other forms, such as *defrutum*, equivalent to *defrutum vinum*, boiled wine; *passum*, equivalent to *passum vinum*, raisin wine; and so *mulsum vinum*, honey wine; *protropum vinum*, untrodden wine, etc., etc. This is so plain a truth that any one acquainted with the usages of the language will immediately recognize it. The lexicons (for example, Harper's "Latin Dictionary," 1880,) corroborate the statement by supplying *vinum* after each of these forms. To say that they were not wines, simply because in common usage *vinum* was omitted, is illogical and absurd. On exactly the same grounds one might deny that claret (French, *clairet*, dim. of *clair*, clear) is wine, or that hock and sherry are. The usage in both cases is precisely similar. In Greek, likewise, γλεῦκος, γλύξις, πρόδρομος, ἔψημα, σίραιον κ. τ. λ., were originally adjectives used with οἶνος, but having incorporated into themselves the signification of the noun, they were generally used substantively. Yet occasionally we find the noun expressed, as in Hippocrates, οἶνος σίραιον. We think this a sufficient answer to Professor Bumstead, who "has yet to learn that the name οἶνος or *vinum* was ever applied to any of these products, (ἔψημα, γλύξις, *carenum*, *defrutum*, and *sapa*,) unless, perhaps, by some figure of speech." † By the side of Professor Ramsey's assertion ‡ that these were "grape jellies and nothing else," we place the testimony of Parkinson, § who calls them *vina*, and that of Dr. Richardson, ‖ who classes them among "wines."

* Varro (i, 13) expressly ranks *mustum* as *vinum*, *Sæpe, ubi conditum novum vinum, orcæ in Hispania a fervore musti ruptæ*, "Often when *new wine* is put up, the casks in Spain are burst by the fermenting of the *must*."

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 63.

‡ Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," art. "Vinum."

§ "Theatrum Botanicum," 1640, p. 1557.

‖ "Cantor Lectures," p. 22.

From the fact that Pliny (xiv, 9) speaks of certain *dulcia*, among which *defrutum*, *carenum*, etc., are enumerated, it has been claimed that they were something distinct from *vina*. This classification includes *mustum*, *passum*, *protropum*, *mulsum*, etc., and would indicate that all, if any, were not wines. But it is by no means an exclusive category. It does not follow, because an article is ranked among the *dulcia*, that it does not also belong among the *vina*. *Dulcia* is an adjective with substantive force, and the word, in this instance, to be understood is *vina*. The chapter (9) which treats of these *dulcia* opens with a statement concerning *vinum omne dulce*, and the whole book (xiv) is devoted to the consideration of *vina* as the next book (xv) is of *olea*, *duo liquores humanis corporibus gratissimi*, (xiv, 22:) "The two liquors most grateful to the human body." Pliny confirms this interpretation when, after quoting several authorities concerning a certain wine called Myrrhina, he says, (xiv, 14,) *Quibus apparet non inter vina modo murrinam, sed inter dulcia quoque nominatum*, "From which it is evident that Myrrhina was classed, not only among wines, but also among sweets," or sweet wines.

Further evidence of the fact that the unfermented juice of the grape was called wine will appear in our examination of the Scripture terms for wine to which we now turn.

2. *The Recognition of Unfermented Wine in the Scriptures.* Our inquiry in this direction will embrace the Scriptures of both the Old and the New Testaments. It is necessary to include the former as well as the latter, since the Old Testament was the only written law of the Church of God until after Pentecost; it was constantly quoted and referred to by Christ, who declared that he came not to destroy but to fulfill it, and it is, therefore, our principal key to the interpretation of the New Testament. Both Testaments discriminate between fermented wine, which is stimulant and intoxicating, and unfermented wine, which is nutritious and unintoxicating. They do this in two ways.

(1.) By the terms in which they speak of wine. In one class of passages it is commended and in another class it is condemned; in each case in the strongest and most unmistakable language. It is described as a blessing (Psa. civ, 15, etc.) and as a curse, (Prov. xx, 1, etc.) It is allowed (Deut. xiv, 26, etc.)

and it is interdicted, (Prov. xxiii, 31, etc.) It is made a symbol of spiritual blessings, (Isa. lv, 1, etc.) and an emblem of divine wrath, (Psa. lxxv, 8.) The natural inference is, that two different substances are designated by these totally diverse characterizations. Says Professor Stuart,* "I cannot refuse to take this position without virtually impeaching the Scriptures of contradiction or inconsistency." But an attempt is made to meet this argument by the citation of other things which, it is claimed, are spoken of in the Scriptures in like contradictory terms. Prof. Bumstead instances rain,† "as a blessing given alike to the just and the unjust," and "as a curse sent to destroy the inhabitants of the earth in a flood." Dr. Moore, with iconoclastic fury, piles example upon example in order "to demolish utterly a specious fallacy by which multitudes have been deceived." ‡ He cites the tongue which St. James calls "a fire, a world of iniquity," etc., but which is, nevertheless, "an organ of unspeakable benefit to man;" wealth, which may be either "a blessing or a snare;" knowledge, which St. Paul says "puffeth up," but which is "elsewhere described in the Scriptures as an excellent thing;" marriage, which the same apostle both approves (1 Tim. iv, 3) and disapproves, (1 Cor. vii, 1;) God, who is "love" and "a consuming fire;" Christ, who is both a Saviour and a "stone of stumbling;" the lion, who is an emblem of Christ and of the devil; leaven, unto which the kingdom of heaven is likened, and of which, as the symbol of Pharisaic doctrine, men are bidden to beware; and the four cups of Passover, which the Talmud expressly declares symbolize both blessings and curses. And then both authors ask if we are to infer in these cases that there are two kinds of rain, tongues, knowledge, etc., or that the distinction lies in the uses of the several objects. As regards the rain, the tongue, the lion, the leaven, and the Passover cups, it is apparent on the surface that they are used in a purely figurative sense, and that in no instance is the object itself intended to be described as intrinsically good or bad. It is not the tongue, for example, that is meant, but the evil disposition which it symbolizes and which would remain were the phys

* "Letter to Dr. Nott," p. 49.

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 65.

‡ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 83.

ical member literally cut out. As regards the other examples, it is not denied that the best gifts may be abused, and that even so excellent a thing as knowledge may become "an occasion of pride." But an isolated instance of warning against the misuse of a good thing furnishes no proper parallel to the scores of warnings against the use of wine,* which is distinctly declared a bad thing.† This remark applies to marriage, which is every-where commended in the Scriptures, save in this special instance, where, under exceptional circumstances, it is suggested as inexpedient. The Bible nowhere condemns wealth or warns against it, but against the inordinate desire for it. When Dr. Moore refers to 1 Tim. vi, 9, 10, in support of his statement‡ that "some people, to be consistent, should put away wealth as an accursed thing," he forgets that those passages say nothing concerning wealth or money, but the love of it. The references to God and Christ, and their twofold attitudes toward sin and the persistent sinner, on the one hand, and toward the repentant believer on the other, are in no sense pertinent to the case in hand.

But the ample vindication of our interpretation of these two classes of passages concerning wine lies in two considerations.

a. First. There are two kinds of wine. We believe this has

* Such, in particular, as Prov. xxiii, 31. Prof. Bumstead ("Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 87) calls it "an intense literalism" to make this "mean an entire prohibition of wine." He says it is "the gloating look of the wine-bibber against which the warning is directed." But this is a strained interpretation which nothing in the simple verb רָאָה, *to see*, warrants. That the sense may be "look not with desire" is possible. But the prohibition is one that ranks in comprehensiveness with the New Testament precept forbidding so much as the lustful look. (Matt. v, 28.) Dr. Moore, who admits that it is a warning "against looking" at "this dangerous wine," ("Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 96,) limits its application to the persons specially addressed, who, he says, are those addicted to its intemperate use; but that is contrary to the terms and spirit of the passage. The prohibition is based, not upon the habits of the person addressed, but upon the dangerous properties of the wine described. Dr. Moore, stating that the passage has a construction similar to Gen. i, 4, "See not wine that it is red," absurdly suggests that it means "Don't put your eyes on these tempting qualities," as though every thing would be all right, drunkenness and all, provided the victim did not fix his gloating eyes on its intoxicating properties. The construction of the particle כִּי, however, is not simply conjunctive, as in Gen. i, 4, but temporal, as in A. V. here, and with an implied causal force, as in Gen. ii, 3, "Look not *because*."

† For example, Prov. xx, 1, "Wine is a mocker." Heb., לֵץ, LXX, ἀκόλαστον. Eph. v, 18, "Wine wherein is excess."

‡ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 82.

been sufficiently proved, but the argument will be re-enforced by evidence soon to be submitted. Just at this point, however, it is important to emphasize the fact that these two kinds are totally distinct in their constituents and characteristics. This is clearly set forth in the following comparative tables: *

Unfermented wine is composed of	Fermented wine is composed of
1. Gluten.	1. *Alcohol.*
2. Sugar.	2. *Œnanthic Acid.*
3. Gum.	3. *Œnanthic Ether.*
4. Various *odorous* matters.	4. *Essential or Volatile Oils.*
5. Malic Acid.	5. *Acetic Acid.*
6. Citric Acid.	6. *Sulphate of Potash.*
7. Phosphorus and	7. Bouquet or Aroma.
8. Sulphur in combination.	8. Chlorides of Potassium and Sodium.
9. Bitartrate of Potash.	9. Tannin and Coloring Matter.
10. Tartrate of Lime.	10. Undecomposed Sugar, gum, etc., in *small* quantities.
11. Water, etc.	

The first six elements in the second table are entirely new compounds, and there is no more chemical identity between the two substances than between barley and beer.

b. Second. The two classes of passages, the one commendatory, the other condemnatory, could not be indiscriminately applied to the two substances. Unfermented wine would not be interdicted, since it is a perfectly natural, nutritious, and healthful beverage. It could not legitimately be made the symbol of wrath and destruction, any more than the bread and oil with which it is often joined. It would be the proper emblem of mercy and salvation, as bread and oil are, (for example, Psa. civ, 15,) and as it is itself, especially in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. On the other hand, the fermented wine could not properly be commended for use or employed as the symbol of blessing and life. We have already seen, by the testimony of the latest and best science, that alcohol in any form or quantity is alien and harmful to the healthy system. It is the product of corruption, and is pronounced a poison both by Scripture and science. Orfilla, Taylor, Christison, the American, United States, French, and English dispensatories, and all the best authorities on toxicology, class it with arsenic, corrosive sublimate, and prussic acid. The Scriptures describe it as a poison. Such is the signification of the Hebrew term

* Dr. Lees' "Text-Book of Temperance," p. 44.

חֵמָה, *chemah.* This is the word the psalmist uses when he says, (Psa. cxl, 3,) "Adder's *poison* is under their lips." This explains the figure in Prov. xxiii, 32: "At the last . . . it stingeth like an adder." So we read, "Their wine is the poison (*chemah*) of dragons," Deut. xxxii, 33. "Take the wine cup of this fury;" literally, take the cup of the wine which is poison, (*chemah,*) Jer. xxv, 15. "The princes have made him sick with bottles" (literally, poison, *chemah*) "of wine," Hosea vii, 5. "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbor drink, that puttest thy bottle" (literally, poison, *chemah*) "to him," Hab. ii, 15. It is incredible that such a substance, which Scripture and science unite in describing as poison, a fermented and alcoholic wine, should in any instance have been the wine which the sacred writers mention in terms of commendation and sanction.

But the Scriptures distinguish between these two wines,

(2.) By the words which they employ to designate them. They discriminate and describe them with an accuracy and affluence of terms which is remarkable when we remember that the Hebrew is comparatively a meager language. In this case our own ordinarily copious tongue suffers in the comparison. For in our English version of the Old Testament the word wine, either alone or in combination with some other word, is used to express no less than eleven different things, which are designated in the Hebrew by as many different terms. How successfully this is done will appear upon an examination of the original words, on which we now enter.

1. יַיִן, *Yayin.*

This is the first and most frequently used word for wine in the Old Testament. It appears in the earliest and in the latest history, from the time of Noah (Gen. ix, 21) to that of Nehemiah, (Neh. xiii, 15.) Gesenius derives it from an obsolete root, יִין, *yon*, "which," he says, "probably signified to boil up, to be in a ferment;" and defines it, "wine, so called from its fermenting, effervescing." But this imports into a primitive term a later and scientific idea, while "new terms, when first imposed, are always expressive of some *simple* and *obvious appearance*, never of latent properties or scientific relations." * Fermentation is not the first, the simplest, or the most obvious

* Dr. Lees, in "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. xxv.

characteristic of grape juice. "Vegetable juices, in general," says Liebig,* "become turbid when in contact with the air before fermentation commences." This characteristic must have been the first to attract attention, and would most naturally have suggested the name. The primitive signification of *yayin* was, doubtless, simply "foaming," "spuming," "bubbling," as Dindorf suggests and illustrates by reference to the kindred Arabic. It would be very naturally and appropriately applied to the grape juice as it rushed foaming into the wine-vat. Moses Stuart says: † "The simple idea of *grape juice*, or *vine liquor*, is the basis and essence of the word in whatever connection it may stand." And Tayler Lewis says: ‡ "*Yayin* and *oinos* simply meant the liquid that comes from pressing the grape. There is no evidence of any further idea associated with it. It was not *fermenting fluid*, but *grape juice*." By a natural extension of meaning it would gradually come to designate wine in all its subsequent stages, and would even be applied retrospectively to the wine still confined in the cluster. That *yayin* was a generic term, including every kind of wine, new or old, fermented or unfermented, intoxicating or unintoxicating, is established by such facts as the following:

a. It is constantly used, occurring oftener than all the other terms for wine combined, in all one hundred and forty-one times.

b. It is employed by Nehemiah (v, 18) in the phrase כל־יין, *kal-yayin*, LXX ἐν πᾶσιν οἶνος, Vulg. *vina diversa*, A. V. "all sorts of wine."

c. It was applied to every species of fermented grape juice, (*e. g.*, Prov. xxiii, 31, where the characteristics of fermentation are distinctly specified.) Concerning this point there is no controversy. But in less than one half of the one hundred and forty-one texts in which *yayin* occurs can it be shown that the term is applied to a fermented article. In many of the other passages the contrary fact is plainly indicated.

d. It is used for the grape in Num. vi, 4, and in Judges xiii, 14, (lit. the wine-vine.)

e. It is spoken of as "gathered," Deut. xxviii, 39; Jer. xl, 10, 11.

* "Chemistry of Agriculture," fourth edition, p. 327.

† "Letter to Dr. Nott," p. 11. ‡ "The Advance," Dec. 24, 1874.

f. It is coupled with *chalab*, which signifies *fresh* milk in distinction from *chemah*, curdled milk, Isa. lv, 1; Cant. v, 1.

g. It is connected with *dagan*, corn, Lam. ii, 12.

h. It is associated directly with the wine press, Isa. xvi, 10; Jer. xlviii, 33.

i. It is used synonymously with *dam-anabim*, "blood of the grapes," Gen. xlix, 11.

j. It is mentioned with approbation, Psa. civ, 15, etc.

k. It is commanded to be offered in sacrifice, (Exod. xxix, 40; Num. xv, 5, 7, 10, etc.,) while all fermented things were excluded from the offerings.*

These considerations must lead the candid mind to the conclusion that *yayin* is a generic term, and includes the fresh and unfermented as well as the fermented and intoxicating juice of the grape.

II. תִּירוֹשׁ, *Tirosh*.

This word occurs thirty-eight times, first in Gen. xxvii, 28. It is translated (A.V.) "wine" twenty-six times, "new wine" eleven times, and "sweet wine" once. More controversy has been waged over this term than over all the other words for wine combined. It is asserted that it always designates a fermented wine.† It is claimed that it always signifies an unfermented wine.‡ It is affirmed that it "denotes wine in the process of growth and manufacture," including "the solid fruit, the unfermented juice, or the fermented product of that fruit and juice."§ It is denied that it means "wine at all, but the fruit of the vineyard in its natural condition."‖ Equally diverse have been the explanations of its etymology. There is a very general agreement as to its derivation from the verb יָרַשׁ, *yarash*, to seize, or dispossess, hence to possess. Gesenius says it is applied to wine "because it gets possession of the brain," than which nothing could be more arbitrary or absurd. Fürst says it signifies "what is got from the grapes." Bythner says¶ it is

* *Vide* Discussion of Lord's Supper, *infra*.

† Dr. Robinson, "Lex. of the N. T;" Dr. William Smith, "Bible Dictionary;" Dr. Moore, "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 110.

‡ G. W. Samson, "The Divine Law as to Wines," p. 70, f.

§ Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 67–69.

‖ Dr. Lees, "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. 28.

¶ "Lyra Prophetica."

used of "the vine as a possession in the eyes of the Hebrews." Dr. Samson, deriving it from the Hiphil conjugation of the verb, as something *causing* possession or dispossession, makes it refer to the laxative effect of the fresh grape juice. The theory is an ingenious one, but can hardly stand the test of application. A careful and critical examination of this term in all the passages where it is used has compelled the conclusion that the view of Dr. Lees is the more nearly correct, and the etymology of Bythner the most probable. *Tirosh* seems to have been the word used for the vine-fruit in its natural, solid state, and with special reference to its being the source and material of wine. But in no instance does it appear to have denoted the liquid product of the grape. Our interpretation of *tirosh* is sustained by the manner in which the Hebrew writers use the term.

a. It is never found associated with לֶחֶם, *lechem*, bread, or with שֶׁמֶן, *shemen*, oil. In thirty instances it is mentioned in connection with דָּגָן, *dagan*, "corn," namely, grain, which in no case signifies an artificial preparation as bread.* In twenty-one instances it occurs in connection with יִצְהָר, *yitzhar*, which is rendered "oil," (Gesenius and A.V.,) but which "is derived, as Dindorf, Gesenius, and others admit, from a root signifying to 'shine,' 'glisten,' like the Spanish term *azahar*, 'orange flower,' and the Latin *aurantium* for the shining orange class of fruits," and probably denotes the olive, which "also shines and glistens in the sun," and other orchard fruit. Dr. Lees, from whom we have just quoted, well says:† "These three terms constitute a beautiful triad of natural blessings, (1) *corn*-fruit, (2) *vine*-fruit, (3) *orchard*-fruit, or, in other words, the produce of field, vineyard, and orchard." These three terms are mentioned together nineteen times. Once *tirosh* is joined with זַיִת, *zayith*, olives, (Micah vi, 14, 15,) and, as this passage is a striking proof of the correctness of our view of the term, we quote it, arranging it in such a way as to bring into view the Hebrew parallelism.

* We do not consider Lam. ii, 12 an exception, (cf. Gesenius.) It makes the picture of the famine more vivid to regard even the raw materials for food as lacking. This passage also illustrates the generic use of *yayin*.

† "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. 29.

Thou shalt eat, but not be satisfied,

. . . . . .

And thou shalt take hold, but shalt not deliver;

. . . . . .

Thou shalt sow, but shalt not reap;
Thou shalt tread the *zayith*, but thou shalt not anoint thee with *shemen*;
And *tirosh*, but shalt not drink *yayin*.

This makes it plain that *tirosh* was regarded as the natural source of *yayin*, as olives were of oil. It also disproves Prof. Bumstead's view that *tirosh* included wine in all stages from "its germinant state in the vineyard" to the finished product after fermentation. It is true he adduces it as "an unanswerable argument" in its favor, but it is no more such than it is a proof that *zayith* meant *shemen* in any state, fresh or old, sweet or rancid. There is no more evidence that *tirosh* ever denoted wine than there is that *dagan*, with which it is so constantly associated, ever denoted bread in any state, whether dough or baked. There is nothing in the etymology or usage of *tirosh* in any passage to sustain Prof. Bumstead's position.

Further facts indicative of the signification which we have given to *tirosh* are these:

b. It is constantly connected with the mention of conditions affecting natural growth, such as drought, (Isa. xxiv, 7; Joel i, 10,) and dew, Gen. xxvii, 28; Deut. xxxiii, 28.

c. It is every-where treated as a natural product. It is found "in the cluster," (Isa. lxv, 8;) "gathered," (Deut. xi, 14:) put into "storehouses," (2 Chron. xxxii, 28;) "trodden," (Micah vi, 15;) "bursts out from the press," (Prov. iii, 10;) and makes the vats "overflow," Joel ii, 24.

d. It is tithed as a natural product of the soil, just as *dagan* and *yitzhar* are. Deut. xii, 17, etc.

e. It is never spoken of as being poured out, put into cups, or drunk, save in a single instance. Isa. lxii, 8. But the interpretation which is so fully supported by a careful induction of every other text in which *tirosh* occurs is not to be set aside on the strength of a single exceptional usage, which is easily and naturally explained as a case of metonomy. There seems to be no warrant for the assertion* that in Deut. xii, 17, and xiv, 23, "the drinking of *tirosh* is intimated by the figure called *zeugma*." In both passages we find the triad, *dagan*,

* Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 67.

yitzhar, and *tirosh*, all solids and all the proper objects of the verb אָכַל, *akal*, to eat.

If our view of *tirosh* be the right one, then there is no need of pausing to examine the single passage which has been adduced in evidence of its intoxicating character: "Whoredom and wine (*yayin*) and new wine (*tirosh*) take away the heart." Hos. iv, 11. Prof. Bumstead is fortunately "quite ready to abandon it." * But Dr. Moore still clings to the old interpretation.† "To take away the heart" in this text does not refer to intoxication, but signifies, as Bishop Lowth says,‡ to "deprive men of their judgment and darken their understanding. So a gift is said to 'destroy the heart.' Eccles. vii, 7." The fact that three distinct things are enumerated, indicates a difference. There is no parallelism in the passage. Whoredom is not *yayin*, and *yayin* is not *tirosh*. The first is undoubtedly used for illicit worship or idolatry; the second for sensual gratification; and *tirosh* for worldly possessions. The three had drawn their hearts away from "God as the infinite Goodness and Fountain of spiritual joy." The whole forms a striking fulfillment of the dying prophecy of Moses, Deut. xxxii, 14–16. We conclude, therefore, with reference to *tirosh*, that it does not signify wine in any sense or case, but the natural fruit of the vineyard in its solid state and regarded as the basis of wine.

III. שֵׁכָר, *Shechar*.

This word occurs twenty-three times, first, in Lev. x, 9. It is rendered "strong drink" (A.V.) in all instances save in Num. xxviii, 7, where it is translated "strong wine," and in Psa. lxix, 12, where, instead of drinkers of *shechar*," the A.V. reads simply "drunkards." As *yayin* is the generic term for the liquid of *tirosh*, so *shechar* is the generic term for the liquor of *yitzhar* § or of any other fruit than the grape, such as dates, pomegranates, etc. It is claimed that the intoxicating nature of the beverage is established by "the unquestionable significance of the word, as indicated by its derivation and use." ‖

* Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 69.

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 110, note. ‡ Com. *in loco*.

§ In Deut. xiv, 26, *shechar* answers to the *yitzhar* of verse 23, as *yayin* answers to *tirosh* in the same verse.

‖ Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 74.

Gesenius' derivation from שָׁכַר, *shachar*, "*to drink deeply, to be drunken*," is cited. But, as Gesenius admits, the verb is used "not always of drunkenness; but sometimes *to drink to the full*." Gen. xliii, 34; Cant. v, 1. This is confirmed by the LXX, which often renders *shachar* by μεθύομαι, the radical signification of which is *to drink to repletion*. The LXX also, and the Greek versions generally, render *shechar* by μέθυσμα, whose root, μέθυ, is cognate with the Sanskrit *madhu*, honey.* So *shechar* is doubtless etymologically akin to the word for sugar in all the Aryan and Semitic tongues. It probably denoted sweet juices of all kinds originally, but came at length, in distinction from *yayin*, to be applied to the juices of other fruits than grapes, and, like *yayin*, was used generically of both fermented and unfermented drinks. The contrast between "sweet" and "bitter" in Isa. xxiv, 9, (literally, "bitter shall be the sweet drink—*shechar*—to them that drink it,") shows that *shechar* was valued on account of its sweetness, a quality which decreases in proportion to the amount of alcohol present.† The facts that it was commanded to be consumed "before the Lord," (Deut. xiv, 26,) and to be offered in sacrifice, (Num. xxviii, 7,) indicate that it included unfermented forms of fruit juice. The "asis of pomegranates," (Cant. viii, 2,) which was an unfermented beverage, was a species of *shechar*. It is further confirmatory of this view that to this day the juice of the palm tree in an unfermented state, when just fresh from the tree, is a common and favorite beverage of the natives of Arabia, and is called by a name whose root is the same as that of *shechar*.‡

IV. חֶמֶר, *Chemer;* חֲמַר, *Chamar;* חֲמְרָא, *Chamrâ*.

The first form occurs twice, (Deut. xxxii, 14, and Isaiah xxvii, 2,) and once as a verb, Psa. lxxv, 8. The other two forms are Chaldaic, and occur six times, Ezra vi, 9; vii, 22; Dan. v, 1, 2, 4, 23. It is from the verb חָמַר, *chamar*, to foam or be agitated, as, for example, the sea, Psa. xlvi, 3. Like *yayin*, it is descriptive of the foaming appearance of the newly-expressed grape juice, or of the same liquor in the process of

* Peile, "Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology," p. 127.

† Kerr, "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 19.

‡ Macleod, "Peeps at the Far East," p. 27.

fermentation. Mr. Bevan, in Smith's "Bible Dictionary," says: "It may equally well apply to the process of fermentation, or to the frothing of liquid freshly poured out, in which latter case it might be used of an unfermented liquid." It does not affect this testimony that the author elsewhere expresses his dissent from the doctrine of an unfermented wine. Like *yayin*, also, *chemer* was undoubtedly used as a generic term, and was probably a poetical substitute for the former, with which it was almost identical in meaning. It signifies a fresh and unfermented beverage in Deut. xxxii, 14, "Thou didst drink *chemer*, the blood of grapes," as the appositive phrase proves. Prof. Bumstead thinks it would "require a painfully prosaic turn of mind to understand 'the blood of the grapes' as meaning simple grape juice, especially when associated with such a word as *chemer* has already been shown to be." * But what has it been shown to be? Certainly not the designation exclusively of a fermented article. The etymology supports no such view. The usage in this case, moreover, which is the earliest on record, gives it no favor. "Blood of grapes" cannot be fairly construed in any other sense than that of "simple grape juice," as will hereafter appear. To argue from a much later usage of this term, where the circumstances of the case were entirely different, that in this earlier instance and primitive age it meant an intoxicating drink, is illogical and absurd. Instead of *chemer* proving "the blood of grapes" a fermented drink in this passage, "the blood of grapes" proves that *chemer* was unfermented. And also, in Isa. xxvii, 2, if the Hebrew text be genuine, it describes the juice of the grape, not as "red," (A.V.,) but "as if already foaming under the treader's feet." In Psa. lxxv, 8, where it is again rendered "red," (A.V.,) it doubtless signifies "foaming." It also, in all probability, denoted a light effervescing wine, like our modern bottled wines. It is doubtless used in this sense in Daniel.

v. אֲשִׁישָׁה, *Ashishah.*

This word occurs four times, first in 2 Sam. vi, 19, and in in each case it is associated with some kind of drink. In Cant. ii, 5, it is rendered simply "flagons;" in the other three in-

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 65

stances it is rendered "flagons of wine." It is conceded on all hands to mean, not wine at all, but a cake of pressed raisins. It denotes, therefore, a solid and not a liquid.

VI. מֶסֶךְ, *Mesek*; מִמְסָךְ, *Mimsak*; מֶזֶג, *Mezeg*.

The first of these cognate forms occurs but once, (Psa. lxxv, 8,) and the third but once, (Cant. vii, 2,) and they are each rendered (A.V.) "mixture." The second form occurs twice, (Prov. xxiii, 30, and Isa. lxv, 11,) and in the first passage is rendered "mixed wine," in the second "drink-offering." These words occur in a verbal shape five times, Prov. ix, 2, 5; Psa. cii, 9; Isa. v, 22; xix, 14. They signify wine compounded with some other ingredient, but whether drugged or diluted is not necessarily indicated. That the latter is sometimes the case is evident from the use of the term in Prov. ix, 2, 5, where the wine which Wisdom prepared was, doubtless, diluted with water, and also in Isa. v, 22.* This is also indicated by the fact that the LXX in these and other passages render the term by κεράννυμι, which always denotes a weakening of wines by dilution.†

VII. שְׁמָרִים, *Shemarim*.

This word, which is the plural of of שֶׁמֶר, *shemer*, occurs five times, first in Psa. lxxv, 8. It is derived from the verb שָׁמַר, *shamar*, to preserve, and has the general signification of "things preserved." Gesenius admits as much, but applies the term in all cases to the dregs of wine, "so called, because when wine is kept on the lees its strength and color are *preserved*." The explanation is far-fetched, and is not needed, at least in the case of Isa. xxv, 6, where the term occurs twice, and is rendered (A.V.) "wines on the lees." It is difficult to understand why wine (*yayin*) should not have been expressed if it is in any way intended or alluded to here. The literal reading of the passage is "a feast of fat things, a feast of preserved things," and the natural inference is that the term answers to our English "preserves." So the earlier translators understood it. Coverdale (1535) rendered "sweet things," and the Bishop's Bible (1568) and Cranmer, (1585,) "deli-

* *Vide* Gesenius, "Lexicon," *sub* מֶזֶג.

† *Vide* Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *in loco*.

cate things." In Psa. lxxv, 8, where it is rendered (A. V.) "dregs," it seems to denote not so much the *fæces* of the wine before being drawn off from the vat as the undissolved drugs of the mixture. In the two other instances of its use, where it is rendered (A.V.) "lees," the LXX suggests other readings altogether: δόξη, glory, in Jer. xlviii, 11, (LXX, xxxi, 11,) and φυλάγματα, defenses, in Zeph. i, 12. In Isa. li, 17, 22, an entirely different Hebrew word is used for "dregs." So *shemarim* may have no reference whatever to the lees of wine. If it does in the two last mentioned passages, as it most surely does not in the first mentioned, its use is so purely figurative as to have no bearing on our present inquiry.

VIII. עָסִיס, *Asis.*

This word occurs five times, first in Cant. viii, 2, where it is used of the juice of the pomegranate. In Isa. xlix, 26, and Amos ix, 13, it is rendered (A.V.) "sweet wine;" in Joel i, 5, and iii, 18, "new wine." It is derived from the verb עָסַס, *asas*, to tread, as all authorities agree. It denotes the newly expressed juice of the grape or other fruit. So the LXX, which renders *νάμα* "juice" and *γλυκασμόν* "sweetness," and the Vulgate, which renders *mustum* and *dulcendo* "sweetness," indicate. The attempt is made* to prove that *asis* included an intoxicating liquor from its use in the passages Isa. xlix, 26, and Joel i, 5. But in the former case, as Prof. Bumstead well observes:† "The point of the comparison lies not in any intoxicating power of the *asis*, but in the manner in which the *asis* is produced by the process of treading."‡ In the second passage the new wine is regarded as the source of the fermented wine. The latter fails because the new wine is cut off, and the new wine is cut off because the vineyards are destroyed by the invasion of insects described in the preceding verse. Prof. Bumstead's view of *asis* as "a poetical substitute for *tirosh*"§ is negatived by the established character of *tirosh* as always a solid and never a liquid, such as he claims it sometimes was. Cant. viii, 2, proves *asis* a liquid, and Joel iii, 18, and Amos ix, 13, do not disprove it. "It would seem to require a painfully prosaic turn of mind to see" only a solid

* Gesenius, "Lexicon," *in loco.*
† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 77.
‡ Comp. Isa. lxiii, 6, and Rev. xix, 15.
§ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 77.

"product of the soil" in the *asis* which the mountains drop down. The dull imagination may be assisted by a quotation from Pallas, who says of the grapes of the Hungarian vintage:* "In August they ripen, burst, and begin to evacuate their juice. The *shirnoi* contains a rich juice and bursts when ripe." Prof. Bumstead attempts to make out an intoxicating character for *asis* by reason of "its association with spiced, or mixed, wine" in Cant. viii, 2, and "the pervading voluptuousness of Solomon's imagery." He calls it, however, "an exceptional use of the word." But the fact that two beverages are mentioned in this passage implies a difference if not a contrast between them; and we should expect to find it in the unspiced and unintoxicating character of the second named. The LXX, which renders it by *νάμα*, and the Vulgate, which renders by *mustum*, both support this view. "The pervading voluptuousness of Solomon's imagery" is better satisfied by making *asis* the new juice than by any other interpretation. Luxury always commands the greatest variety, and in that age considered the freshly expressed beverages among the choicest. We conclude, therefore, from the etymology and usage of *asis*, that it always denotes a sweet and unfermented liquor.

IX. סֹבֵא, *Sobe.*

This word occurs but three times. It is derived from the verb סָבָא, *saba*, to drink to satiation, and probably denoted a rich boiled wine, such as would speedily surfeit. It corresponded to the Greek ἕψημα, Latin *sapa*, to which it is doubtless etymologically akin, and to the Italian and French *sabe*. In Isa. i, 22, the allusion to mixing with water favors the view of a boiled wine. Hosea iv, 18, literally "sour is their *sobe*," suggests Columella's remark, (xii, 20,) "*Defrutum* is accustomed to grow sour (*solet acescere*) however carefully prepared." In Nahum i, 10, the sense may be, "soaking as with *sobe*," though the LXX has an entirely different reading here. There is no proof that *sobe* ever designated an intoxicating beverage.

X. עֲנָבִים, *Anabim.*

This word means, literally, "grapes," but in one instance (Hos. iii, 1) it is rendered (A. V.) "wine," under a mistaken

* Travels, (1793,) i, 314, quoted in "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. 27.

notion of the meaning of *ashishah*, with which it is immediately connected in the same passage.

XI. יֶקֶב, *Yeqeb.*

This word means, literally, wine-press or vat, but it is rendered (A. V.) "wine" once, Deut. xvi, 13. The phrase should read, "In thy gathering from thy floor and from thy press."

This completes the list of Hebrew words translated in our English Version by "wine" or by any phrase containing the word. There remain, however, five other terms signifying the liquid product of the grape, and better deserving the rendering "wine" than many we have considered.

XII. דַּם־עֲנָבִים, *Dam-anabim.*

This expression occurs in Gen. xlix, 11, rendered (A. V.) "blood of grapes," and in the singular, *dam-enab*, (A. V.,) "blood of the grape," in Deut. xxxii, 14. "Blood" is a poetical name for juice. It was used not so much with reference to the color of the liquid, for grape juice is generally, though not always, colorless, as to the fact that the life of the vine is in it. Cf. Lev. xvii, 11. The term is employed in the same sense now. Dr. Macleod, for example, calls the fresh and limpid juice of the palm "a genuine product of nature, and *the very blood of the tree.*" * We shall see in our discussion of the Lord's Supper that no other form of grape juice than the unfermented can with any propriety be called "the blood of the grape."

XIII. מִשְׁרַת־עֲנָבִים, *Mishrath-anabim.*

This phrase occurs but once, (Num. vi, 3,) and is rendered (A. V.) "liquor of grapes." *Mishrath* is derived from the verb שָׁרָה, *sharah*, "to loosen, to macerate," according to Gesenius, who defines the phrase, "the steeping of grapes." Dr. Thomas Laurie says † it refers to "a drink made in that way, [steeping,] and drank before it ferments."

XIV. דְּבַשׁ, *Debash.*

This word is derived from a verb דָּבַשׁ, *dabash*, to knead, "as being glutinous like a kneaded mass.‡ It is always rendered (A. V.) "honey," but in not more than three cases out of

* "Peeps at the Far East," p. 27. † "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1869.
‡ Gesenius, "Lexicon," *in loco.*

nearly fifty where it occurs does it mean honey from bees, but honey of grapes, that is, the fresh juice boiled down to a syrup. "At the present day," says Gesenius, "this syrup is still in common use in Palestine under the Arabic name *dibs*."

XV. חֹמֶץ, *Chometz.*

This word occurs six times, first in Num. vi, 3, and is in each case rendered (A. V.) vinegar. It is derived from the verb חָמַץ, *chamatz*, "to be sharp, pungent," and denotes the juice of the grape or of other fruits which had undergone both the alcoholic and the acetous fermentations. It was a thin, sour wine something like the French *vin-ordinaire*.

XVI. מַמְתַקִּים, *Mamtaqqim.*

This word occurs twice, and is derived from the verb מָתַק, *mathaqh*, "(1) to suck, (2) to be sweet, sweet things being wont to be sucked,*" and signifies "sweetnesses, or sweet things." It is applied to the mouth (Cant. v, 16) as full of sweet things, and in Neh. viii, 10, "drink the sweet," it denotes the thick, sweet wines, devoid of intoxicating properties, which needed to be largely diluted before they were drunk.

Coming now to the New Testament we find five Greek terms used for beverages made from the grape and other fruits, but of these only two are in any instance rendered "wine" in our English Version. We shall briefly consider them.

I. Οἶνος.

This word occurs thirty-two times, outnumbering all the other terms in use four to one. It has the same generic sense in the New Testament that it has in classic usage, and that *yayin* has in the Hebrew. Moses Stuart says:† "In the New Testament we have *oinos*, which corresponds exactly with the Hebrew *yayin*." As has been already suggested, the two terms probably have a common etymological origin. Every argument for including unfermented wine under the Hebrew term applies with equal or augmented force to the Greek, for *οἶνος* has really a wider range of meaning than *yayin*, since the Hebrew has several distinct roots to express differences denoted in the Greek by adjectives qualifying this single generic term. In the New Testament usage it comprehends "new

* Gesenius, "Lexicon," *in loco.* † "Letter to Dr. Nott."

wine," *οἶνος νέος*, (Matt. ix, 17 and Mark ii, 22,) "sweet wine," *γλεῦκος*, (Luke x, 34,) and "sour wine," *ὄξος*, (Mark xv, 23.) These several passages will be considered under their appropriate heads in the further discussion of this subject.

II. *Γλεῦκος.*

This word occurs but once, (Acts ii, 15,) where it is rendered (A. V.) "new wine." We have established its reference to an unfermented beverage in the classical writings, and the single instance of its occurrence in the New Testament confirms this view. Professor Bumstead says* that it "clearly refers to an unfermented liquid," and successfully joins issue with Robinson, Bevan, Alford, Moore, and others who attempt to deny it.

III. *Σίκερα.*

This word, which occurs but once, (Luke i, 15,) is a literal rendering of the Hebrew *shechar*, and like that is doubtless used generically for all kinds of beverages made from other fruits than the grape.

IV. *Οἶνος νέος.*

This word is used nine times, (Matt. ix, 17, twice; Mark ii, 23, three times; Luke v, 37, twice, 38 once, 39, *νέος* expressed and *οἶνος* understood,) and is rendered (A. V.) in each instance "new wine." It was perhaps a general term for grape juice recently expressed, and may have included that which had begun to ferment. But in its New Testament usage, in the single connection in which it appears, it denotes a freshly expressed and unfermented liquor, as we shall see.

V. *Ὄξος.*

This word occurs six times (Matt. xxvii, 34, 48; Mark xv, 36; Luke xxiii, 36; John xix, 29, 30) in connection with the accounts of the crucifixion, and is in each case rendered (A. V.) "vinegar." It is equivalent to the Hebrew *chometz*, and designated, like that, a thin, sour wine. It will be more fully considered hereafter.

VI. *Γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου.*

This expression is employed three times (Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 18) in connection with the record of the institution of the Lord's Supper, and is rendered (A.V.)

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 81.

"fruit of the vine." It signifies the first and simplest product of the grape, the fresh juice. It will be discussed at length in our consideration of the Lord's Supper.

Summing up the results of our inquiry concerning the terms for wine in the Scriptures, we find that

1. There are eleven words in the Old Testament and two in the New, thirteen in all, which are rendered (A. V.) by "wine" either singly or in connection with some other word.

2. There are five other terms in the Old Testament and four others in the New, nine in all, which refer to the juice of the grape or of other fruits in some form. So that

3. There are in all, in both the Old and New Testaments, twenty-two terms which are applied to the products of the grape or of other fruits.

4. But of these twenty-two terms, there are five which have no reference whatever to the juice of the grape or to the juice of any fruit: one (*tirosh*) denotes the vine fruit in its natural, solid state; another (*ashishah*) denotes a cake of pressed raisins; another (*shemarim*) denotes the insoluble dregs of the wine, or, more probably, "preserves" or confections; another (*enab*) denotes simply the grape; and the fifth (*yeqeb*) denotes the wine-press.

5. Of the remaining seventeen words and phrases which do refer to the juices of fruits, three Hebrew terms (*yayin*, *shechar*, and *chemer*) and two Greek terms, (οἶνος and σίκερα,) five in all, are generic. One Hebrew term (*chometz*) and one Greek (ὄξος), two in all, denote a wine that has entered the acetic stage of fermentation. One Hebrew term (*mesek*, etc.) denotes a wine, either fermented or unfermented, which has been drugged or diluted. And six Hebrew terms (*asis*, *sobe*, *dam-anabim*, *mishrath-anabim*, *debash*, and *mamtaqqim*) and three Greek terms, (γλεῦκος, οἶνος νέος, γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου,) nine in all, denote some form of unfermented grape or other juice. So that

6. With the exception of one Hebrew and of one Greek word, which designate a beverage that has entered the acetic stage of fermentation, there is no term in the Old Testament or in the New which invariably indicates a fermented liquor, while there are nine which signify an unfermented article, and six others, the most important and by far the most frequently used, which leave us absolutely free to decide, by reference to

the context or circumstances of the case, whether or not a fermented wine is intended.

Having examined at length the assumption which underlies this whole claim, that the example of Jesus Christ gives its sanction to the moderate indulgence in alcoholic drinks, namely, that neither in his own time nor in any other age was the unfermented juice of the grape in common use as a beverage, and that such an article was not, and in the nature of things could not properly be, recognized or denominated as wine, and having shown this assumption to be false, both from the evidence of the ancient classics and from the testimony of the sacred Scriptures, we come now directly to the

IV. Examination of the Charge

that the example of Jesus sanctions the use of alcoholic beverages. This is composed, as we have previously stated, of three specifications, which we shall consider in the order already named.*

First Specification: Jesus MADE *intoxicating wine.*

The instance cited, and it is the only one of the kind, is the replenishing of the wine at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee. (John ii, 1–11.) Some cause, perhaps the unexpected number of the guests attracted by the presence of Jesus,† had exhausted the stock of the host. At this juncture Jesus miraculously provided a fresh supply of the beverage, in quantity somewhere between one hundred and one hundred and sixty gallons,‡ and in quality so superior that the ruler of the feast remarked to the bridegroom, (A. V.,) "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now." (John ii, 10.) So far there is no controversy. Jesus did make wine. But did he make a fer-

* *Vide* p. 17, *supra.*

† So Bengel suggests, (Gnomon of the N. T. *in loc.*)

‡ *Vide* Lange, "Comm." *in loc.* It is immaterial to our inquiry, however, whether we regard the whole amount of water in the jars as transformed into wine at once, (so Trench, and commentators generally,) or gradually, as the liquid was poured into each cup, (so Ellicott, "Comm." *in loc.;*) or whether we understand with Westcott ("Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles," p. 15) that the wine was drawn directly from the fountain from which the servants had taken the water to fill the water-pots.

mental and intoxicating wine? Only in case we are compelled to return an affirmative answer to this question has the fact any force as an argument against his total abstinence principles and practice. The word used in the Gospel narrative to describe the article made by Jesus is the generic *οἶνος*, and this gives us no intimation as to its nature, but leaves us free to decide, by internal evidence and moral likelihood, whether the wine was alcoholic or the contrary. The simple record of the evangelist affords ample material for determining the question.

1. The fact is stated (v. 9) that "the water was made (*γεγενημένον*, lit., 'had become') wine." This form of expression seems to indicate the transformation of the water into the pure blood of the grape in the same manner in which it takes place every year within the growing clusters of the vine, but differentiated from that by the supernatural rapidity of the process. St. Augustine was perhaps the first among the commentators to suggest this interpretation.* It has been adopted by such authorities as Chrysostom,† Bishop Hall,‡ Trench,§ Meyer, Olshausen, Whedon,‖ Geikie,¶ and others. If this interpretation be correct, it settles the whole controversy. Christ never made a drop of alcoholic wine in the grape. In the whole realm of living nature he has never once created an atom of alcohol. That destructive spirit is nowhere a product of nature. "Alcohol is a purely artificial product, obtained only by carefully carried out chemical methods. It exists nowhere in nature," says Dr. Niel Carmichael.** Dr. Richardson describes alcohol†† as "an artificial product devised by man for his purposes." Similar is the testimony of Sir Humphrey Davy,‡‡ Liebig,§§ Chapital,‖‖ and Turner.¶¶ If Jesus did make an alcoholic substance on this occasion, as Chancellor Crosby, Dr. Moore, and Professor Bumstead would have us believe that he did,*** then the act

* In Evang. Joan., tr. viii. † Hom. xxii, in Joan.
‡ "Contemplations." Lond., 1759, p. 117.
§ "Notes on the Miracles," p. 115. Comm. *in loc.*
¶ "Life and Words of Christ," i, 479.
** "Medical Temperance Journal," April, 1880, p. 125.
†† "Cantor Lectures," p. 178. ‡‡ "Agricultural Chemistry," 6th ed., p. 129.
§§ "Letters on Chemistry," 2d series, 1845.
‖‖ "L' Art de Faire le Vin," Paris, 1819, p. 2.
¶¶ "Elements of Chemistry," p. 664.
*** "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 80. "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 88. "A Calm View of the Temperance Question."

was without a parallel in creation. It was, moreover, a palpable contradiction of the doctrine he announced a few months later, namely, "The Son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise," (John v. 19;) for the Son had never seen the Father make an intoxicating wine. That, as we have seen, is purely a human invention, and probably the most fatal one man has ever sought out.

2. The wine Jesus provided was pronounced "the good" (τὸν καλόν) by the ruler of the feast, (v. 10.) The term is used comparatively, "the" (τὸν) being emphatic, and is equivalent to the best wine. It is interpreted by our authors * to mean the most intoxicating wine. But this is to beg the whole question. It is to set up a false criterion, and bring everything to the test of that. It is to make the vitiated taste of a nineteenth century sot the standard of the taste of a Jewish architriklinos of the first century. It will not do to answer that this interpretation is sustained by the custom, referred to in the remarks of the ruler of the feast, of setting forth the best wine at the beginning of a feast. For this is only to bolster up one fallacy by another. It is not true, as these interpreters would have us believe, that the strongest wines formed the first course of an entertainment, and then, when these had blunted the taste, beverages of an inferior quality were palmed off upon the guests. Evidence in support of such a theory has been diligently sought for, but without success. Meyer admits † that "the general custom, however, to which the table-master refers, is not elsewhere with any certainty confirmed." It is in evidence, on the other hand, that the general custom of a banquet was to use at the beginning of a feast the lighter and largely diluted wines, while the heaviest and specially intoxicating sorts were reserved to the last. That this was true of Christ's day is plainly indicated by a passage from Philo, one of his contemporaries, who describes the votaries of wine proceeding from one kind to another, and finishing up "with bowls and goblets of all the largest sizes that they can get, and drinking the wine unmixed in huge draughts." ‡ Athenæus § and

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 80. "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 88. "A Calm View of the Temperance Question." † Comm. *in loc.*

‡ "On Drunkenness," sec. 53. § "Banquet," X, p. 431, b.

Diogenes Laertius* bear similar testimony. The fact that in this instance the verdict of the ruler of the feast was pronounced merely upon tasting (ἐγεύσατο, v. 9) the wine, shows that its superior qualities must have been such as commended themselves immediately to the palate. He did not wait to observe its supposed alcoholic or intoxicating effects.

Have we any evidence as to what actually was the judgment of antiquity concerning the best wine? Dr. Moore attempts to show,† though not in immediate connection with this text, that "the wine which the Bible pronounces *the best*," was fermented and intoxicating. In proof of this position, he cites Prov. xxiii, 31, where the wine against which a warning is directed is described (A. V.) as moving itself aright, (Heb. יִתְהַלֵּךְ בְּמֵישָׁרִים, (lit., "goes according to evenness,") and then compares this with Cant. vii, 9, (in Heb. verse 10,) "where," as he remarks, "regarding 'the best wine' it is said, הוֹלֵךְ לְמֵישָׁרִים, which is rendered in our English Bible 'that goeth *down* sweetly;' in the margin, 'straightly.' 'The roof of thy mouth like the best wine for my beloved that goeth down sweetly,' etc. This is the meaning of the phrase in Prov. xxiii, 31, as the best interpreters allow. It is an attractive property, a characteristic of the best wine, that it goeth (down) straightly, or smoothly, or sweetly." But an examination of the Hebrew text shows that the comparison is unfounded, and the inference illegitimate. Vicar Kingsbury well says of this passage:‡ "The A. V. here is one of the numerous instances of needless departure from the order of words in the Hebrew." The original reads, word for word, "And thy palate, like the wine of the good, going to my beloved straightly, flowing over the lips of the sleeping." The thought is not, as the A. V. might seem to suggest, that the best wine slips down smoothly. "Down" is not in the text, and neither the smoothness nor any other quality of the liquor is suggested. The palate (that is, the words which come from thence, though some understand kisses,) is compared to the best wine, which was so choice that it deserved to be sent *directly* to the beloved one. So the LXX renders, πορευόμενος τῷ ἀδελφιδῷ μου εἰς εὐθύτητα, going to my kinsman in a straight way. Cranmer and the Geneva Bible

* Op. i, 104. † "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 87.
‡ "Speaker's Commentary" *in loc.*

both translate, "wine which goeth straightly unto my beloved."* Going straightly to the beloved, and not going smoothly down the throat, is the idea of the passage, and so lends no support to the theory of Dr. Moore.

Opposed to that theory is such testimony as follows. Volney, after describing the unfermented and boiled sweet wines of Syria, adds: "Such are the wines of Lebanon, so boasted by Greek and Roman epicures."† Rev. W. H. Rule, who, in general, sympathizes with the views of Dr. Moore, confesses that the pure grape juice was "the choice beverage of epicures."‡ The practice of the Egyptian kings, already adverted to, is confirmatory of this view. Dr. Jacobus says of the wine made by Christ:§ "All who know of the wines then used will understand the unfermented juice of the grape. The present wines of Jerusalem and Lebanon, as we tasted them, were commonly boiled and sweet, without intoxicating qualities, such as we here get in liquors called wines. *Those were esteemed the best wines which were least strong.*" Moses Stuart in his letter to Dr. Nott writes: "I regard it as established beyond fair contradiction, that it was a very common thing to preserve wine in an unfermented state, and that *when thus preserved it was regarded as of a higher and better quality than any other.*"‖ It must also be observed that the adjective used to describe the wine made by Christ is not *ἀγαθός*, *good*, simply, but *καλός*, *that which is morally excellent or befitting*. The term is suggestive of Theophrastus' characterization of unintoxicating wine as *moral* (*ἠθικός*) *wine*.¶

3. Christ provided "the good wine" when the guests had "well drunk," v. 10. Does this expression of the ruler of the feast imply the intoxication of the guests? Prof. Bumstead, following Bengel and others, says that it does not,** "for the remark of the master of the feast was a general one concerning the custom of the times." This is hardly consistent, however, with what he has just said, namely: "The character of it (the wine) in that instance is clearly indicated by the

* *Vide* Dr. Patrick, Cowles, *et al.*, Comm. *in loc.*

† "Travels in Egypt and Syria," c. xxix, p. 382.

‡ "Brief Inquiry," quoted Nott's "Lectures on Temperance," p. 222.

§ Comm. *in loc.* ‖ Letter to Dr. Nott, New York, 1848, p. 44.

¶ De Causis Plantarum, v, 16, 16.

** "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 80.

remark of the master of the feast." For, if the ruler's remark holds good on one point, it does on the other. It cannot logically be divided. The definiteness of the last clause carries along with it the special applicability of the whole. It necessitates the inference that on this occasion also the general custom had been followed. And if these authors are correct who insist that the wine used at this festival was alcoholic, then we are driven to the conclusion that, after free potations of this beverage, which had exhausted the supply and occasioned more or less drunkenness, Jesus miraculously created a large additional quantity of the fiery fluid, so that the company could continue their reckless indulgence and deepen their maudlin into mad intoxication. But such a conclusion stops scarcely short of blasphemy.

It becomes important, therefore, to examine this term which is rendered "well drunk." The Greek is *μεθυσθῶσι*. The form is an aorist passive from *μεθύω*, whose tenses, excepting the present and imperfect, are supplied by the passive of its derivative *μεθύσκω*.* Both of these verbs occur in the New Testament, as well as the noun *μέθη* and the adjective *μέθυσος*, used substantively. Lexicographers are agreed that the root *μέθη*, or *μέθυ*, signifies excessive drinking without reference to the kind of liquor used. All etymologists connect it directly with the Sanscrit *madhu*,† whose primary meaning, according to Benfey, was honey,‡ but, according to Curtius, was sweet drink.§ The same root appears in the Latin *te-me-tum*, Sclavic *medu*, Lith. *midus*, Gaelic *mil*, O. H. G. *metu*, Ang.-Saxon *medo*, Eng. *mead*, all of which signify either honey or a drink made from honey.‖ The idea of cloying sweetness, and so of satiation, is clearly traceable in this root and in all of its derivatives. The verbs *μεθύω* and *μεθύσκω* retain this primary signification of fullness. Hesychius defines *μεθύει* by *πεπλήρωται*, he has filled himself.¶ Liddell and Scott give as the first meaning of this verb, "to be drunken, given to drink," and add, as a secondary signification, "to be drenched or soaked with, steeped in, any liquid."** This arrangement, while it may fairly

* Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.*

† *E. g.*, Pott, Benfey, Curtius, Vanicek, Peile, *et al.*

‡ "Sanscrit Dictionary," *s. v.* § "Griechische Etymologie," *s. v.*

‖ Peile, "Greek and Latin Etymology," p. 127. ¶ "Lex.," *s. v.* ** "Lex.," *s. v.*

indicate the relative frequency with which the verb is used in these different senses, really reverses the natural order, and puts primitive for derivative usage. Bloomfield correctly defines *μεθύειν*, "to moisten, or to be moistened with liquor, and in a figurative sense, (like the Lat. *madere vino*,) to be saturated with drink." * In the classical writings these verbs often have the sense of being soaked in or filled with any liquid.† Homer, *e. g.*, ("Il.," xvii, 39,) speaks of *βοείη μεθύουσα ἀλοιφῇ*, "an ox-hide steeped in fat." Similar instances occur in Anacreon, (Ode 47;) Hippocrates, ("De Rat. Vic.," iii;) Xenophon, ("Cyr.," i, 3;) Aristotle, ("ap. Stob. Phys.," T. 2, 312;) Theophrastus, ("Ch. Eth.," 13;) Plutarch, ("Alex.," 69;) Philo, ("De Agric.," p. 209, E.) The last-named author furnishes one very important piece of testimony as to the meaning and use of this verb. He says, ("De Plant. Noae.," p. 234,) "There is a twofold *μεθύειν:* one is to use wine—*οἰνοῦσθαι*—the other is to play the fool with wine—*ληρεῖν ἐν οἴνῳ.*" But, what is more to our purpose, in the LXX. *μεθύω* is repeatedly used in its primary sense of repletion. In Gen. xliii, 34, it is said of Joseph's brethren, *ἐμεθύσθησαν μετ' αὐτοῦ*, they drank freely with him; undoubtedly of that freshly expressed grape-juice which was the favorite beverage of Egyptian royalty. In Psa. xxiii, (LXX., cp. xxii,) 5, we read *τὸ ποτήριόν σου μεθύσκον*, "thy cup runneth over;" in Cant. v, 1, *πίετε καὶ μεθύσθητε*, "drink, yea, drink abundantly;" in Jer. xxxi, 14, (LXX. cp. xxxviii,) *μεθύσω τὴν ψυχὴν τῶν ἱερέων*, "I will satiate the soul of the priests," etc. But where examples are so numerous, quotation is unnecessary. Dr. Lees has made a large collection of such texts, showing the application of this verb to food, milk, water, blood, and oil, as well as to wine.‡ Coming now to the New Testament, we find that *μεθύω* occurs seven times, (Matt. xxiv, 49; John ii, 10; Acts ii, 15; 1 Cor. xi, 21; 1 Thess. v, 7; Rev. xvii, 2, 6,) and the derivative *μεθύσκω* three times, (Luke xii, 45; Eph. v, 18; 1 Thess. v, 7.)

* Notes on 1 Cor. xi, 21.

† Similar to the use of *μεθύω* in classic Greek is the use of *inebrio* in Latin for *saturate* and *satiate*. Cf. Pliny (N. H. i, 9) *inebriatæ radices;* and (xiv, 1,) *uvæ vino suo inebriantur*. Likewise *ebrius*, *e. g.*, in Terence, (Hecyra, v, 23,) *cum tu satura atque ebria eris*. Comp. also French *soûler*, "1. to surfeit, to glut; 2. to satiate; 3. to intoxicate," (Surenne, Dict.) Also the Scotch *fou*, full, with secondary sense of drunken, in which sense the English word is sometimes used.

‡ Works, vol. ii.

In both forms of the verb the primary idea of surfeit is prominent. A decisive instance of the use of the former in this sense is presented in 1 Cor. xi, 21. In mentioning the abuses of the agapæ in the early Corinthian Church, St. Paul says (A. V.): "For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper: and one is hungry, and another is drunken," *καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς μεθύει.* But *μεθύει*, in this case, is plainly contrasted with *πεινᾷ* which is correctly rendered as "hungry." The antithesis, therefore, requires the former to be understood in the generic sense of "surfeited," not in the narrow sense of "drunken." The overfilled man is compared with the underfilled man. This is the interpretation adopted by the great body of expositors, ancient and modern.*

Μεθύω, therefore, does not always and necessarily signify intoxication. It does not in John ii, 10. It has in this passage its natural and primitive sense of satiation. It refers simply to the large quantities of wine which had been consumed on this occasion, and has no reference whatever to any inebriating effects. Dean Stanley, one of the most conservative of scholars, in discussing *μεθύω*, has said,† "Its use in John ii, 10, shows that it need not be always taken of intoxication." He might have spoken with less caution. The whole drift of the narrative, and the imperative requirements of the case, show that in this instance it must not be taken of intoxication.‡ Five centuries ago Wycliffe recognized this, and rendered the expression, "whanne men ben fulfilled." The A. V. gives the weight of its authority to this interpretation by translating "when men have well drunk," as does the R. V., also, which renders more accurately, "when men have drunk freely."

4. The declared end and object of this miracle was to manifest forth his glory, (v. 11.) It was not to put the sanction of his divine approval upon the marriage relation, although this was incidentally accomplished; much less was it "for the sake of contributing to the enjoyment of a festive company, and thus sanctioning the use of (intoxicating) wine as a luxury."§

* *E. g.*, St. Chrysostom, Bengel, Grotius, Kuinoel, Bilroth, Macknight, Newcome, Bloomfield, Clarke, Lightfoot, Whedon, *et al.*

† "Comm. on Corinthians," *in loc.*

‡ So Beza, Cornelius à Lapide, De Wette, Rosenmüller, Tholuck, Jamieson, Brown, Conant, Norton, *et al.*

§ Prof. Bumstead in "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., '81, p. 86.

Not that he did not wish to add to the innocent enjoyments of men, and to hallow the hospitalities and amenities of social life. But these were not the objects of his first miracle. That object was as infinitely superior to these as the real purpose of his last ordinance was superior to the motive attributed to him by Professor Bumstead,* for the selection of one of its elements, namely, "to secure the permanency of his example in regard to (intoxicating) wine, even to the remotest parts of the earth and to the latest periods of history." The sublime and incomparable object of "this beginning of miracles" was the Epiphany of his glory. "Glory is God's own attribute."† He who has seen his glory has seen God himself. (Exodus xxxiii, 18–23.) When he would reveal himself to man he made a revelation of his glory. The opening act of that revelation was an act of creation. We know him because we have seen his glory in Genesis. "For the invisible things of him *from the creation of the world* are clearly seen, being understood by *the things that are made*, even his eternal power and godhead." (Rom. i, 20.) So Christ must demonstrate his identity with the Father. Men will recognize "*his* eternal power and godhead" only when they see his glory manifested in an act of creation. That is the meaning of the miracle at Cana. It is the new Genesis. It is the revelation of Christ as Creator. "He made the water wine." (John iv, 46.) This points unmistakably to the nature of the thing that is made. The wine of the miracle must have been the same as the wine of nature; the wine of the water-pots must have been one with the wine of the grape-clusters. No other is made, all else is manufactured. Nothing less than omnipotence could make one drop of the pure juice of the grape. The art of man can manufacture any amount of alcoholic wine.

One thought further in this connection: Christ's miracles, as has been carefully observed, were never miracles of mere power.‡ With the single exception of his withering the barren fig-tree, which had no relation to mankind save in the moral lesson which it conveyed, they were always miracles of mercy. He came not "to destroy men's lives, but to save them." (Luke

* Prof. Bumstead in "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 87.

† Whedon, "Commentary on John," ii, 11. ‡ *Vide* "Ecce Deus," p. 70.

ix, 56.) And all his power was put forth to that benevolent end. But if this theory of his manufacturing an intoxicating wine be the true one, then that must stand as the single exception to all his other miracles. It was a malevolent and mischievous manifestation of power. There was no glory in it, but shame. It was the production of a substance which God his Father had cursed as the fruitful source of "woe" and "sorrows," "contentions" and "babbling;" of "redness of eyes" and "wounds without cause," (Prov. xxiii, 29;) which, partaken of in the smallest quantities, "is likely to do harm,"* and in larger quantities is certain to work destruction; which "injures the body, and diminishes the mental powers,"† perverts the conscience, depraves the heart, and destroys the soul. (1 Cor. vi, 9.) And this miracle of malevolence was wrought at a moment when it offered the strongest temptation to men already overcome with indulgence. It was wrought, moreover, as Professor Bumstead, with amazing candor, confesses,‡ "with a full knowledge of all the intemperance then existing and destined to exist in after time. He was aware of the gross intemperance both in food and drink which characterized the Roman world during the luxurious period of its history in which he was on the earth. He knew to how many in Palestine, who had misused it, wine had proved to be a 'mocker.' He could see how many in future time, this nineteenth century included, it would 'bite like a serpent and sting like an adder.' He was aware that his example would have a powerful influence on coming generations. Yet with all this knowledge distinctly in mind, he created it (intoxicating wine) for festive use." Is this, we would fain ask, the work of one "who went about doing good," (Acts x, 38,) who was "holy, harmless, and undefiled," (Heb. vii, 26;) who came "to succor them that are tempted," (Heb. ii, 18,) and to "have compassion on them that are out of the way" (Heb. v, 2,)? Would such a manifestation of power have been diabolic or divine? Would such a miracle have produced the result recorded of this?

5. That result is set forth in the statement, "And his disciples believed on him," (v. 11.) The miracle had the effect of confirming the faith of the few followers he had already

* Professor Bumstead. † Sir Henry Thompson.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 109.

gathered about him, and of gaining still other converts. Their faith was the natural consequence of the manifestation of his glory. That was his ground and its justification. They had seen in his instantaneous creation of the pure and nutritious juice of the grape convincing evidence of his benevolence and power, and they naturally believed in him. But such belief could not, by any laws of thought, supernatural or human, have followed, had they beheld him encouraging and ministering to drunkenness. Nor can we conceive of his adopting any such method for the establishment of his claims or the extension of his cause. He was not a Mohammed, holding out to men the allurements of a sensual paradise, but a "man of sorrows," whose stern requirement of all who came after him was, that they should deny themselves and take up their cross and follow him. (Matt. xvi, 24.) And it was by the personal embodiment and the practical encouragement of self-denial and abstinence, and not by the example or sanction of luxury and self-indulgence, that he won his followers and achieved his victories.

Second Specification: Jesus COMMENDED *intoxicating wine.*

This charge is based on his allusions to wine in two recorded instances. The first occurs in the three parallel passages, Matt. ix, 17; Mark ii, 22; Luke v, 37–39. We shall confine ourselves to the passage as found in Luke, since it is in substantial agreement with the other two, and contains an important addition not found in the narratives either of Matthew or of Mark. The whole passage reads (A. V.): "And no man putteth new wine (*οἶνος νέος*) into old bottles, (*ἀσκούς*, lit., skins;) else the new wine will burst the bottles, and be spilled, and the bottles shall perish. But new wine must be put into new bottles; and both are preserved. No man also having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better." It is only in this passage, and those parallel with it, that the *οἶνος νέος* occurs in the New Testament. It is important for us to determine its application here. The common opinion, perhaps, has been that it denotes wine recently expressed, but already in a state of active fermentation. Such a liquid, it is said, could not safely be put into a leathern bottle which had become "old, rent, and bound up," since the pent-up forces would speedily tear their way through the tender

fabric. But when the skin was new and strong, it is claimed, it could withstand the strain of fermentation, or, being elastic, could stretch and still retain its integrity. But this is an interpretation of the imagination. No bottle, whether of skin or glass, or, for that matter, not the strongest iron-bound cask, could hold together if once fermentation should get under full headway.* The carbonic acid gas generated by the process would shatter a new *askos* almost as quickly as an old one. Job knew this, when he said (chap. xxxii, 19): "Behold my belly like wine hath no vent; like *new bottles* it is rent."

But if *οἶνος νέος* be not wine in the act of fermentation, it can no more be wine which has completed that process, "because," as Prof. Bumstead acknowledges, "if the fermentation were complete, old bottles would be as serviceable as new ones." The conclusion, therefore, would seem to be inevitable, that, if it were neither a wine in active fermentation, or one fully fermented, it must have been unfermented. Not so, however, if we are to believe Prof. Bumstead. He says,† it was "a new wine which had not fully fermented, but which had come so near the completion of that process that it could with safety be put into the new skins, whose elasticity would be sufficient to resist the 'after-fermentation' which would ensue." Similarly Vicar Bevan‡ says: "We should be inclined to understand the passage above quoted (Matt. ix, 17) as referring to wine drawn off before the fermentation was complete, either for immediate use or for forming it into sweet wine." Prof. Bumstead, in explanation of the phrase, "after-fermentation," refers to Dr. Edward Smith's "Foods," p. 389. This author does not employ the expression "after-fermentation," but he says, on the page indicated, with reference to the manufacture of Aulese wine: "The fermented juice is allowed to remain until the middle of winter, namely, until February, when it is racked off from the lees, and renewed fermentation with the return of warmer weather is thus prevented or greatly lessened." On the very same page, in speaking of ordinary

* "A must one fifth sugar develops forty-seven times its volume of carbonic dioxide, equivalent to a pressure of 34.3 atmospheres. This would be about ten times the pressure the boiler of an ordinary high-pressure steam-engine has to undergo."—*Thudicum and Dupré*, p. 478.

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 82.

‡ Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Wine."

wines, he says: "When the violence of fermentation has subsided, and the liquor is becoming clear and no longer sweet, it is racked off and run into tuns for perfect fermentation and ripening." This authority, for reference to which we are indebted to Prof. Bumstead, makes three points plain, namely:

1. That the "after-fermentation" is "prevented or greatly lessened" by simply racking off the wine from the lees after allowing a sufficient time for subsidence. But in such a case old bottles would do as well as new, and there would be no necessity, such as is stated, for the use of the latter.

2. That after "the violence of fermentation has subsided," that is, after the wine would be ready to bottle on this theory, it is "no longer sweet," and so could not be made to subserve the purpose suggested by Mr. Bevan.

3. That for "perfect fermentation and ripening" the wine is not bottled, but left to stand in the tun. And this is in exact accordance with what we know of the practice of the ancients, for fermentation, when permitted, was carried on in the *lacus* or the *dolium*.*

These facts show the baselessness of the hypothesis that *οἶνος νέος*, in this case, was a wine which awaited the after stage of fermentation. If, therefore, it was a wine in neither of these three conditions, active fermentation, after-fermentation, or completed fermentation, it must have been wine in an unfermented state. But to this Prof. Bumstead again objects.† "If the liquid were entirely unfermented, not even the new bottles, or skins, would be able to resist the power of the fermentation." That is to say, pure grape-juice could not be put into an *askos* without undergoing fermentation. But is this true? It could certainly have been inclosed before fermentation had begun. "Spontaneous fermentation," that is, fermentation which is not hastened by the artificial introduction of yeast germs, "is always slow in beginning."‡ Sometimes it does not take place until after three or four days' exposure to the atmosphere.§ Would fermentation necessarily take place within the skin? We have already seen that the ancients

* "Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," art. "Vinum."

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 82.

‡ Prof. Dittmar, in "Encyclopædia Britannica," Ninth Ed., art. "Fermentation."

§ *Vide* Kerr, "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 8.

were familiar with the methods by which fermentation is prevented, and were in the habit of employing them in the preparation of their wines. In this case any one of them might have been adopted with success. The grape-juice could have been carefully expressed and filtered, or, if that were not deemed security enough, it might, in addition, have been inspissated by boiling, and any incipient trace of alcohol expelled. Then it could with perfect safety have been put into a bottle, which might have been so prepared as to entirely exclude the air; and, this done, no other precaution would have been necessary. It was with this end in view that a new skin was always selected, one that was neither cracked nor ripped. Then it was prepared like the amphora, by smearing with honey,* grease, † or pitch, ‡ and when the liquid had been poured in, was tightly closed and sealed. That the leathern bottle would serve the purpose as well as the earthen flask cannot be doubted. Whatever would exclude the water would prevent the access of the air. The skin of the grape which permits the evaporation of the moisture does not allow the entrance of the yeast germs. The "must of grapes or juice of fruit, if boiled and suspended in a bladder in the midst of fermenting must or wort, will not ferment." § And this suggests another and most important reason why a *new* skin was required for *new* wine. It would not only be perfectly sound, but perfectly sweet. An old skin would almost inevitably have some of the sour remains of a former vintage adhering to it. So that when the fresh grape-juice was poured in, no matter how carefully the air was thereafter excluded, fermentation would necessarily ensue. It is on this same account that Columella, an almost contemporary author, in describing the common process of preserving unfermented wine, (xii, 41,) lays equal stress on its being put into a *new amphora.*

* Burckhard, ("Travels in Syria,") speaking of the Beyrouk honey of the Syrians, says: "They use it in rubbing their water-skins in order to exclude the air."

† Bruce, ("Travels in Egypt," etc.,) describing the *gerbas*, or ox-skins squared and the edges sewed together by a double seam which does not let out the water, says: "They are then all smeared on the outside with grease, as well to hinder the water oozing through, as to prevent it being evaporated by the heat of the sun."

‡ Chardin, ("Travels in Persia,") says that "wine in Persia is preserved in skins saturated with pitch, which when good imparts no flavor to the wine."

§ "Amer. Cyclop.," art. "Fermentation;" Watts' "Dict. of Chemistry," ii, 625.

But if all these precautions should be deemed insufficient, others were still possible. We have seen that it was customary, after the *amphora* or *cadus* was filled and sealed, to plunge and keep it in water whose temperature would not permit of fermentation. This method was adopted with the *askos* as well as with the *cadus*, except that, while the latter was usually immersed in water, the former was more generally buried in the earth.* Any one of these processes of removing the gluten, evaporating the moisture, preventing the access of the air, or reducing the temperature of the liquid below 40 degrees Fah., would have resulted in the preservation of an unfermented wine; or, if it had been deemed best, any two or all of these methods might have been combined, and to make assurance doubly sure the liquid might have been subjected to a thorough sulphur fumigation. And so Prof. Bumstead's objection that the new wine, had it been a perfectly fresh grape-juice, must necessarily have undergone fermentation in the new bottles, is shown to be unfounded, and our former conclusion that it must have been precisely such a liquor, an unfermented wine, the pure juice of the grape, remains unshaken, and must be accepted as the only legitimate explanation of the passage in question. †

This brings us to the consideration of the thirty-ninth verse: "No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better." Though not found in the other Gospels this passage is plainly an integral part of the parable, and belongs naturally to the narrative. It is really the important portion for us, since it contains, if any thing does, Christ's outspoken commendation of intoxicating wine. The first question which arises in our inquiry concerning it is, Whether the term "new wine" has the same signification in this verse as in the two preceding. Prof. Bumstead appears to think not. The "new wine" of verse 38, he says,‡ "must have been new wine which had not fully fermented," but in verse 39 it may "have denoted wine that was fully fermented, but which had

* Jahn's "Biblical Archæology," sec. 69.

† This furnishes another proof, therefore, of the generic character of *olvος*, since, in this instance, our Lord must have used it to designate the unfermented juice of the grape. Cf. Canon Farrar, in "Cambridge Bible for Schools." Luke, Excursus, ii, p. 375.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 82.

not acquired that mellowness which only age can give." So the authors of the "Temperance Bible Commentary" seem to favor the view that "the 'new wine' of verse 38 is identical in nature and representative of the same Christian blessings with the 'old wine' of verse 39—being the new preserved and improved by age." (P. 295.) It cannot, indeed, be maintained that *οἶνος νέος* always denotes a wine which is free from fermentation. It does not manifestly in the LXX, (Job xxxii, 19.) But there can be no doubt that it does in the present instance. Neither can there be any question that it is used in this sense in the LXX, (Isa. xlix, 26.) There the Hebrew *asis*, which designates an unfermented wine, is rendered: LXX, *οἶνος νέος*; Vulgate, *mustum;* A. V., "sweet wine." And in the passage under consideration the legitimate, if not necessary, inference is, that it has the same signification as in the passage preceding. Used thus consecutively, and without any intimation of a change of meaning, we naturally conclude that it has undergone none. There is no confusion or contradiction of metaphors in the parable. The "new wine" of verse 39 is the "new wine" of verse 38, and the "old wine" of verse 39 is the "new wine" fermented and strengthened by age.* With this explanation of the passage it remains to be said that the expression "The old (wine) is better, (than the new,)"

1. Is not Christ's judgment as to the better wine. He does not utter it as his own opinion. He repeats it as the verdict of a certain class of persons whom he distinctly specifies. *They* think the old wine is preferable. He does not in any degree join in their commendation.

2. It is not "the universal judgment of men" concerning the better wine, as Dr. Moore calls it. † Neither does it make plain, as Prof. Bumstead claims, ‡ "that wine in either of these imperfect states," that is, unfermented or partially fermented, "was not a favorite beverage with the Jews." It simply says that one who has acquired a taste for the old wine does not care for the new. We know this to be the case. The effect of drinking alcoholic liquors is to beget an appetite for stimulants

* Dr. Abbott renders, ("Comm. on John," p. 33,) "No man having drunk old (fermented) wine, straightway desireth new, (*that of the last vintage and unfermented,*) for he saith, The old is better."

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 91.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 82.

which grows with indulgence.* And the longer it is gratified, the stronger must be the beverage that will satisfy its craving. A simple, unintoxicating wine, therefore, would have no charm for one accustomed to strong drink. But Dr. Moore criticises† this interpretation in the shape propounded by Rev. Dr. Rich, who says:‡ "This was not the judgment of Christ respecting the superiority of old, fermented wines, but of drunkards whose habit it had been to drink them." Dr. Rich is able to defend his own position, and others perhaps would not deem it necessary to say, "No *drunkard*," etc. But Dr. Moore's criticism calls for consideration in the interests of the general question. He directs attention to the fact that "Christ does not say, 'No drunkard having drunk old wine,' etc., but 'no one,' *οὐδείς*." This word *οὐδείς*, however, is not always or necessarily universal in its application, any more than our "no one," which is often used in a limited or partial sense. That the Greek word is sometimes so employed in the New Testament is evident from John iii, 32: "No man (*οὐδείς*) receiveth his testimony," John says, speaking of Christ. But he immediately adds, (verse 33,) "He that hath received his testimony," etc., showing that the negative was not used in an absolute sense. If it had been intended to make an unqualified statement in the passage we are considering, the separate forms *οὐδὲ εἷς* would have been used,§ as we find them in Rom. iii, 10, and 1 Cor. vi, 5. Dr. Moore further objects that Christ "does not speak of those 'whose *habit* it had been to drink old fermented wines,' for he uses the aorist participle, *πιών*, which does not mark a habit." True, but neither does it deny one. The aorist, outside of the indicative mode, does not necessarily imply a single or transient action. In the other modes it represents an action simply as brought to pass.‖ The briefest act of drinking, for example, may be viewed as going on, and thus be expressed by the present; so the most protracted drinking may be viewed simply as brought to pass, and thus be expressed by the aorist. In the participle form the aorist

* *Vide* Richardson, "Dialogues on Drink," p. 92.

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 91.

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," July, 1880, p. 404.

§ Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.*; Robinson, "Lexicon of the New Testament," *s. v.*; Winer's "New Testament Grammar," Thayer, p. 173.

‖ Hadley, "Greek Grammar," sec. 716.

represents an action as introduced before that of the principal verb, while in its continuance it may coincide with the latter.* These usages of the aorist are illustrated in Luke v, 39. It may with literal exactness be rendered: "No one, after he has begun to drink old wine, straightway desireth new."

The text does not say such an one will never desire the new. He will not all at once. Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Westcott, and Hort, and the R. V., omit εὐθέως, straightway, but nevertheless the sentence requires it. Godet well says:† "It is altogether an error in the Alexandrine that has erased here the word εὐθέως, immediately. The very idea of the parable is concentrated in this adverb." All the known facts in the case warrant its retention. Habits and tastes change gradually. But here there is a strong implication that a slight experience will work a transformation of prejudices, and the old wine give place to the new. The received text of this passage has χρηστότερος, rendered (A. V.) "better." But codices ℵ, B, L, etc., read χρηστός, "good." This reading is adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Alford, Westcott, and Hort, and the R. V. Alford, although far from being a supporter of our views, admits‡ that the expression contains "no objective comparison whatever between the old and new wine." It is merely the opinion of the individual who is quite satisfied with what he has. It is good enough for him.

3. The judgment contained in this passage, even though it were the universal one, is false. It is contradicted by the very connection in which it occurs, and by the whole purpose of the illustration which it serves. The two dispensations, the Jewish and the Christian, are set forth under the figures, respectively, of the old wine and the new. But the Jewish dispensation was not superior to the Christian; fermented wine is not preferable to unfermented; the old is not better than the new. Only those familiar with the old and unacquainted with the new are naturally reluctant to change. As Lange remarks:§ "The old remains good only so long as one is not accustomed to the new, which in and of itself is better."

The only other passage which can be quoted to sustain the

*Hadley, "Greek Grammar," sec. 717. Winer, "Grammar of the New Testament;" Thayer, p. 342.

† Comm. *in loc.* ‡ Comm. *in loc.* § Comm. *in loc.*

charge of Christ's commendation of wine is found in the parable of the Good Samaritan, (Luke x, 34:) "And he went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring in oil and wine, (*ἔλαιον καὶ οἶνον.*)" It requires but a brief consideration. The commendation implied in this narrative is of the medicinal use of wine solely. It is a commendation, too, of its outward and not of its inward application. There is no intimation whatever of any internal administration of the wine. Nor is there any evidence that the wine which the Good Samaritan carried and used was of a fermented and intoxicating sort. The contrary fact is indicated. The record was made by Luke, who, as a physician, must have understood the medicinal character and uses of wine. He knew undoubtedly that in their outward application they follow the law of their internal use. Alcoholic wine is an "irritant poison," * whether taken into the stomach or applied to the surface of the body. It would not allay, but seriously increase, the inflammation of a wound. Christ could not have commended the use of so unsuitable and injurious a medicament, nor could Luke have recorded its use in such a case with his own tacit approval. But an unfermented wine, a pure and limpid grape-juice, would have made a grateful lotion. Combined with the oil, it would have served as an excellent emollient. It is probable that the article used was a compound of oil and wine, called by Galen, (xiii, 859, B,) *ὀνέλαιον*; noticed by Africanus, ("Geop.," x, 49;) described by Dioscorides, ("Matt. Med.," i, 67;) and numbered by Pliny (xv, 7) among the medicated oils. The latter gives to it the name of *oleum gleucinum*, and tells us that it was made by incorporating *mustum oleo*, unfermented wine, (*γλεῦκος*,) with olive-oil, (*ἔλαιον.*) Dioscorides specifies the same constituents, and calls the compound *γλευκίνον.*† If, therefore, there be any commendation of wine in this parable, it is that in which all abstainers can join.

3. *Third Specification: Jesus* USED *intoxicating wine, and* COMMANDED IT TO BE USED *until the end of time.*

It is assumed that he used such a beverage at the marriage feast in Cana of Galilee, and as he sat at the table with publicans and sinners; although no mention is made of his personally partaking of wine of any sort in these or in any other

* *Vide* "Story on Alcohol," pp. 76–80.

† This furnishes still another proof of the generic character of *οἶνος*, since it is used by Luke to describe the *γλεῦκος* of the compound.

instances, save in the two about to be considered.* And as we have already examined these other cases, we may omit any further reference to them. The two occasions on which it is recorded that Jesus did make use of wine, and on which it is asserted that the wine used was fermented, are (1) the Last Supper and (2) the Crucifixion. We shall separately consider them.

I. Chancellor Crosby,† Dr. Moore,‡ and Professor Bumstead,§ all claim that Christ employed fermented wine at the Last Supper. Dr. Moore frankly says, "He instituted the Holy Supper in wine on which unworthy communicants could get drunk, (1 Cor. xi, 21.)" We have to examine this charge, and see whether it can be substantiated. All the evidence bearing upon the case may be gathered from three sources, namely, (i) The circumstances under which the Supper was instituted, (ii) The language in which the event is recorded, (iii) The practice of those by whom the rite was perpetuated.

i. *The circumstances under which the Supper was instituted.*—The celebration of the Jewish Passover was the occasion of the institution of the Christian sacrament. (Matt. xxvi, 19; Mark xiv, 16; Luke xxii, 13.) The elements of the former furnished the emblems of the latter. The drink of the one constituted the drink of the other.‖ But what was the drink of the Passover? There is no mention of any beverage in the many statutes concerning the festival, or in the frequent references to its observance found in the Old Testament. It had become an established custom, however, to use wine at the Passover, "at all events in the post-Babylonian period."¶ In none of the allusions which the Old Testament makes to the use of wine for religious purposes, is a fermented article indicated;** and in the only reference which it contains to the use

* It is taken for granted that Christ himself participated in the meal of the Passover and the Last Supper. This is settled, we think, by Matt. xxvi, 29, etc. *Vide* Meyer, "Comm.," *in loc.*

† "A Calm View," etc.

‡ "Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 88.

§ "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 87.

‖ The same, of course, is true of the bread, and for ourselves we should not hesitate to follow out the argument to its legitimate consequences.

¶ Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," art. "Wine."

** Two terms are employed in the requirements and references concerning drink-offerings. They are the generic *yayin* (Exod. xxix, 40; Lev. xxiii, 13; Num. xv, 7; xxviii, 14; Deut. xiv, 26; Hos. ix, 4) and the generic *shechar*, (Num. xxviii, 7; Deut. xiv, 26.) The first drops that reached the lower vat

of wine at any of the great religious festivals an unfermented sort is distinctly specified.* The practice of the Jewish Church in this particular, during the transitional period between the close of the Old Testament canon and the opening of the New Testament dispensation, is illustrated by a passage in the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus. Speaking of the high-priest Simon, probably that Simon who bore the surname Just, (B. C. 310–290,) † this book says, (l, 14, 15,) "And finishing the service at the altar that he might adorn the offering of the most high Almighty, he stretched out his hand to the cup, and poured of the blood of the grape, (ἐξ αἵματος σταφυλῆς ;) he poured out at the foot of the altar a sweet-smelling savor unto the most high King of all." All the analogies of the case, therefore, would lead to the conclusion that the wine of the Passover was an unfermented drink. But we are not confined to analogies for our argument. It was the law of this feast, enacted at the beginning and never annulled or amended, that nothing fermented should enter into its observance. It was called the feast of "sweetnesses," or of "unfermented things." (Exod. xxiii, 15.) ‡ Its law ran thus, (A. V. :) "Seven days thou shalt eat unleavened bread, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unleavened bread shall be eaten seven days; and there shall no leavened bread be seen with thee, neither shall there be leaven seen with thee in all thy quarters," (Exod. xiii, 6, 7.) Nothing could be more emphatic or explicit. Not only were unfermented things alone to be eaten during the festival, but every thing that had been fermented, or that was capable of producing fermentation, was to be rigidly excluded from sight. That this was the import of

were called the *dema*, or tear (A. V.) "liquors," and formed the first-fruits of the vintage, which were to be presented to Jehovah, (Exodus xxii, 29.) This was unquestionably a perfectly fresh and unfermented article, like the Latin *protropum*.

* Neh. viii, 10. The Feast of the Tabernacles is referred to, and the fact that this occurred during the grape harvest confirms the unfermented character of "the sweet," *mamtaqqim*, already noted.

† *Vide* Lange, "Commentary on the Apocrypha," Introduction, p. 279.

‡ אֶת־חַג הַמַּצּוֹת, *eth-chag ham-matzoth*, does not signify "the feast of unleavened *bread*." That requires לֶחֶם, *lechem*, "bread," to be expressed, as in Exod. xxix, 2. Cf. *challath matzoth*, "an unleavened cake," Num. vi, 19. *Vide* "M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia," art. "Leaven."

the command, and that it covered liquids as well as solids, wine as well as bread, appears from the following considerations:

a. The word twice rendered (A. V.) "unleavened bread" in the passage just quoted is מַצּוֹת, *matzoth*. It is the plural of מָצָה, *matzah*, (r. מָצַץ, *matzatz*,) which signifies "sweetness, concr. sweet, *i. e.*, not fermented."* It is used indefinitely and substantively—there is nothing in the text corresponding to "bread"—and means "sweetnesses," or "unfermented things."

b. The word twice rendered (A. V.) "eat" is the verb אָכַל, *akal*, which is frequently used in the same general sense as the English eat, including the taking of all kinds of refreshments, both meat and drink, (*e. g.*, Genesis xliii, 16; Deut. xxvii, 7; 1 Sam. ix, 13,) and may be rendered in this instance, "to partake of."

c. The word rendered (A. V.) "leaven" is שְׂאֹר, *seor*, (from the obsolete root שָׂאַר, *saar*, cognate with the verbs שָׂאַר, *shaar*, סִיר, *sir*, to become hot, to ferment, and akin to the Anglo-Saxon *sur;* Germ. *sauer;* and Eng. *sour*.)† It means literally "the sourer," and is applicable to any matter capable of producing fermentation—to all yeasty or decaying albuminous substances—and so may be translated "ferment."

d. The word rendered (A. V.) "leavened bread" is חָמֵץ, *chametz*, from a root of the same form, and signifying to be sour, acid, leavened.‡ It denotes, generically, any substance which has been subjected to the action of *seor*. Like *matzoth*, it is used substantively and indefinitely, with nothing in the context corresponding to (A. V.) "bread." It may be translated "fermented thing." That it is as applicable to liquids as to solids is proven by the use of the kindred form *chometz*, vinegar, or sour wine.§

* So Gesenius, "Lexicon," *s. v.* But Fürst assigns to it the idea of *thinness;* Kurtz, of *dryness;* Knobel and Keil, of *purity*. Gesenius' explanation, however, is most generally accepted. Sweetness, in this connection, has the sense of uncorrupted or incorruptible, and so is easily associated with the idea of dryness and purity. The Arabic word having the sense of pure, to which Knobel and Keil refer *matzoth*, is a secondary form. The root has the same meaning assigned by Gesenius to *matzoth*. (*Vide* "Speaker's Commentary" on Exodus xii, 17.)

† Gesenius, "Lexicon," *s. v.* ‡ *Ibid.*

§ "In Num. vi, 3, *chametz* is applied to wine as an adjective, and should there be translated fermented wine, not vinegar of wine."—*M'Clintock & Strong's Cyclopedia*, art. "Leaven."

The entire passage, (Exodus xiii, 6, 7,) therefore, may with literal accuracy be rendered: "Seven days thou shalt partake of unfermented things, and in the seventh day shall be a feast to the Lord. Unfermented things shall be partaken of seven days; and there shall no fermented thing be seen with thee, neither shall there be any ferment seen with thee in all thy quarters." That this prohibition must have included fermented wine as well as leavened bread, will still further appear from a brief consideration of the *raison d'être* of the enactment. It was not intended, as Professor Bumstead declares,* to remind the people of Israel "of the haste with which they left Egypt, (Deut. xvi, 3,) having no time to put leaven in their dough," a reason which, he says, "would not apply to the wine." But it does not apply to the bread. Neither the passage to which he refers, nor any other in the sacred narrative, gives any intimation that this was the primary purpose of the statute. On the contrary, it is evident from Exodus xii, 8, compared with xii, 39, that the command to eat unleavened bread was given before the departure of the Israelites, and when there was plenty of time for the dough to leaven.† Neither was there any moral significance in the circumstance of haste deserving the perpetuation of ages. But this law was grounded in the very nature of things, and was designed to set an object-lesson for succeeding generations. Fermentation is a process of putrefaction, and ferment or leaven is a substance in a state of putrefaction.‡ By the very closest association of ideas, therefore, it becomes the natural symbol of moral corruption. Christ illustrated and confirmed this symbolism when he bade his disciples "beware of the leaven of the Pharisees," (Matt. xvi, 6, 12;) as did St. Paul when he admonished the Corinthians to "purge out the old leaven," (1 Cor. v, 7.) The Jews employed it in their representations of the depravity of human nature,§ and the ancient pagan world recognized its significance in the law which forbade the high-priest of Jupiter to touch leaven "because it was made by corruption, and cor-

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 72.

† *Vide* Alexander's Kitto's "Biblical Cyclopedia," art. "Passover."

‡ "Turner's Chemistry," by Liebig, 1842, p. 991. It is worthy of notice that the Latin writers use *corruptus* as signifying fermented: and Tacitus ("Germ." 23) and Macrobius ("Sat." vii, 12, 11) apply the word to the fermentation of wine.

§ *Vide* "Babyl. Berachoth," 17, 1. Cf., also Persius, "Sat." i, 24.

rupted the mass which was mingled with it."* Its exclusion from the sacrifices of the Jews was based upon precisely the same principle,† as was also the requirement that salt, as the preventive of corruption, should form a part of every offering, (Lev. ii, 13.)‡ The prohibition of leaven was not peculiar to the Passover, but antedated the institution of that festival, and applied to the greater part of the Jewish ritual. The use of leaven was strictly forbidden in the meat-offering, (Lev. ii, 11,) the trespass-offering, (Lev. vi, 17,) the consecration-offering, (Exod. xxix, 2; Lev. viii, 2,) and the Nazarite offering, (Num. vi, 15.) The show-bread also was unleavened, (Lev. xxiv, 5–9.)§ Nor was this prohibition confined exclusively to bread or even to solids. It was extended to *debash*, grape-honey, (Lev. ii, 11,) as peculiarly liable to fermentation. It likewise, in all probability, applied to milk, (Exod. xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21.)‖

But in no form is this element of corruption more actively present than in alcoholic wine, and any interdiction of it so searching and sweeping as the law of the Passover must have embraced its existence and energy in that shape. The Jews have so understood the law. The rabbis have always interpreted it as including liquids. The Mishna expressly specifies certain fermented drinks whose use would be a violation of the feast, and in general forbids all liquors made from grain.¶ It is claimed, however, that "in the things which, according to the Mishna, transgress the Passover, *wine* is not spoken of, nor any drink prepared purely from *fruit*."** This is readily

* Plutarch, "Rom. Quæs.," 109; Aulus Gellius, x, 15, 19.

† *Vide* Keil and Delitzsch, "Comm.," on Exod. xii, 8, 9.

‡ *Vide* Ewald, "Antiquities of Israel," Edinburgh, p. 34.

§ *Vide* Josephus, "Antiq. Jud.," iii, 6, 6; Talm., *Minchoth*, v, 2, 3.

‖ "As early sacrifices were boiled, the ordinance [forbidding the seething of a kid in its mother's milk] means that the sacrifice must not be boiled in milk, which, from the fermenting quality of the latter, may be a variety of the law against leaven in ritual. Milk, no doubt, was generally eaten in a sour form, (Arabic *aquit.*) Bokhâry, vi, 193." W. R. Smith, "The Old Testament in the Jewish Church," p. 438, note.

¶ Haec sunt in causa transgressionis Paschatis; Cutach Babylonicum, cerevisia Mediae et acetum Edomœum, et Zytus Ægypticus, et Zoman tinctorum et Amilan coquorum et pulmentum librariorum. Regula generalis haec est quicquid est e speciebus frumenti, ecce propter hoc transgreditur Pascha.—*Pesachoth*, Part II, p. 142.

** Dr. Moore, in "Presbyterian Review," January, 1882, p. 87.

granted. It is even true that Maimonides and Bartenora, Spanish rabbins of the twelfth century, in their comments on the Mishna, distinctly state that the juices of fruits, including wine, were allowed at the Passover by the ancient Jews. But on what ground were such beverages permitted? On the remarkable hypothesis, according to Maimonides, that "the liquor of fruit does not engender fermentation, but acidity!" * This concedes the whole case, and shows that alcoholic wine could be used only by a denial of its real nature. Of significance in this connection, is the rabbinical ordinance that no Jew shall enter a place where wine or other fermented liquors are sold during Passover week, and that, if one of that race and religion is a vintner, he must close out his whole stock previous to this festival.† It is also important to observe that distilled spirits, under whatever name, have always been interdicted at the paschal supper.‡ Facts such as these make it plain that in the judgment of the Jews, ancient and modern, the law of the Passover extended to the prohibition of every kind of fermented liquor. And yet we have the statement specifically and repeatedly made, and supported, as it is claimed, by "superabundant evidence," § in the shape of testimony from Jewish sources, that the fermented juice of the grape is regarded as the only legitimate wine for Passover use. Now, if this were true without any qualification, and if it expressed the universal usage of modern Judaism, it would even then not necessarily be determinative of primitive thought and practice in this particular. For there is no certainty that the memorial Passover, which now alone the Jews are able to observe, is identical in custom and ceremonial with the original and sacrificial Passover. ‖ But such a statement is not unqualifiedly true. Testimony on this subject is not unanimous, and uni-

* Chametz Vematzah, v, 1, 2.

† *Vide* "Sunday Magazine," 1870, p. 730, art. "Passover Observances."

‡ Freshman, "Jews and Israelites," p. 66.

§ Dr. Moore, in "Presbyterian Review" for January, 1882, p. 89, who gives a number of specimens of this evidence. Some of it, however, contains noteworthy concessions. One witness (Rev. J. H. Bruehl, p. 90) says, in regard to the raisin wine used by the Jews at the Passover, "They are perfectly indifferent about fermentation." Another witness (Dr. Gottheil, p. 91) testifies that while the use of *fermented* wine is proper at the Passover, unfermented is permitted in certain cases.

‖ *Vide* Canon Farrar on Luke xxii, 18, in the "Cambridge Bible for Schools."

formity of practice does not prevail. There is much evidence, of an unimpeachable sort, on the other side. Mr. Allen, an authority on all matters pertaining to modern Judaism, writes, with reference to the wine of the Passover: "They [the Jews] are forbidden to drink any liquor made from grain, *or that has passed through the process of fermentation.* Their drink is either pure water or raisin-wine prepared by themselves." * Dr. S. M. Isaacs, an eminent Jewish rabbi, and formerly chief editor of "The Jewish Messenger," says: "The Jews do not, in their feasts for sacred purposes, including the marriage feast, ever use any kind of fermented drinks. In their oblations and libations, both private and public, they employ the fruit of the vine—that is, fresh grapes—unfermented grape-juice and raisins, as the symbol of benediction. Fermentation is to them always a symbol of corruption, as in nature and science it is itself decay, rottenness." † Another leading rabbi of New York city has recently testified, that "Fermented wine, as every thing fermented, is rigidly excluded from our Passover fare, in accordance with the spirit of the divine command, Exodus xii, 19." ‡ In accounting for and estimating this conflicting, not to say contradictory, evidence, it is necessary to bear in mind that there are two distinctly marked parties among the Jews—the one orthodox, the other liberal. The former, who are strict in their interpretation of the Law and in their obedience to its requirements, rigorously exclude all fermented drinks from the feast of the Passover. The latter, who are latitudinarian in doctrine and lax in practice, deny that the law of the Passover extends to the wine. Not a few of this school place the wines of commerce on the paschal board; some neglect altogether the ordinance of their fathers; others rob the rite of all significance by denying the supernatural character of the events which it commemorates. There is good reason for believing, however, that the stricter or orthodox view prevailed in our Lord's day. So impartial an authority as Dr. A. P. Peabody says § that he "has satisfied himself, by careful research, that at our Saviour's

* "Modern Judaism," London, 1830, p. 394.

† Quoted in Patton, "Bible Wines," p. 83.

‡ Quoted by Dr. Charles Beecher in "The New Englander," July, 1882, p. 520.

§ "The Monthly Review," vol. xliii, p. 41.

time the Jews—at least the high ritualists among them—extended the prohibition of leaven at the Passover season to the principle of fermentation in every form; and that it was customary at the Passover festival for the master of the household to press the contents of 'the cup' from clusters of grapes preserved for this very purpose." And Dr. Charles Beecher declares * that "after a somewhat careful search" he has come to the same conclusion. But whatever may be the facts in the case, however much the Jews may have misunderstood the law, perverted its meaning, overlaid it with their traditions, or made it of none effect by their practices, it does not affect the matter at issue. It is not their custom which we are endeavoring to determine, but the conduct of Christ. And about this there ought to be, and there can be, no controversy. He who came "not to destroy, but to fulfill," (Matt. v, 17,) and whom it became "to fulfill *all* righteousness," (Matt. iii, 15,) could not ignorantly, and would not intentionally, have broken or infringed the Law, either in its letter or in its spirit. He could not have celebrated the Passover in a wine which had undergone fermentation, and so had become a symbol of corruption.

We advance another step now, and proceed to consider

ii. *The language in which the institution of the Lord's Supper is recorded.*—This is preserved to us with singular uniformity in the first three Gospels, and in almost the same form in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. The words of these records are largely the personal utterances of Christ himself, so that they come to us with especial significance, and each adds its own weight to the argument. After mentioning the blessing and breaking of the bread, the narratives continue:

a. "And he took (received, Luke) the cup—τὸ ποτήριον—and gave thanks"—εὐχαριστήσας—(Matt. xxvi, 27; Mark xiv, 23; Luke xxii, 17.) St. Paul simply says: "After the same manner also the cup," (1 Cor. xi, 25.) Some good manuscripts omit the article before "cup" in Matthew and Mark, but its use by Luke and Paul is undoubted. The reference, as most authorities agree, is to the third of the four cups at the passover meal, called the "cup of benediction," (*Cos ha-Berâchah.*) It was this cup with which the Christian ordinance was

* "The New Englander," July, 1882, p. 520.

inaugurated. For it the great Founder of the feast gave thanks as he consecrated it to its new and holier uses. And, when it had been transferred to the sacramental table, it was still called "the cup of blessing," (1 Cor. x, 16.) It is not necessary to suggest that "the cup" is put by metonomy for its contents. They were the subject of thanksgiving, the medium of blessing. Such, indeed, would be the pure and nutritious juice of the grape. Such never could be the wine upon which God had poured his maledictions, and upon which he had warned his children not to look. We cannot conceive of Christ bending over such a beverage in grateful prayer. The supposition is sacrilegious. The imputation is blasphemous. No cup that can intoxicate is a cup of blessing, but a cup of cursing. It is not "the cup of the Lord," but "the cup of devils." (1 Cor. x, 21.) It does not belong to a eucharistic feast, but is the fit accompaniment of scenes of revelry and riot.

b. "And gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it," Πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, literally, Drink all ye of this, (Matt. xxvi, 27.) "And they all drank of it," (Mark xiv, 23.) "Take this and divide it among yourselves," (Luke xxii, 17.) Why Christ should have singled out the wine, and insisted that all should partake of that, may not be plain, but the fact is patent. Rome, in attempted justification of her course in denying the cup to the laity, may limit the injunction to the apostles and their ecclesiastical successors, but Protestantism easily exposes the falsity of such an interpretation. All of Christ's true disciples every-where are commanded to drink of the sacramental cup. There is no exception, absolutely none. If the contents of that cup be the uncorrupted and nutritious juice of the grape, there need be none. But if they be the fermented wine so many allege, then there are many of our Saviour's faithful followers who cannot and who ought not to partake. There are constitutions to which alcohol in any form or quantity is an active poison,* and there are none to which it is not more or less harmful. It ought never to pass the pure

* "There are some persons on whom the smallest quantity of alcohol seems to act like the taste of blood on a tiger, producing in them a wild desire for more, and destroying all self-control. For them alcohol is a poison, and total abstinence their only safeguard." Dr. Brunton, editor of "The London Practitioner," in "The Alcohol Question," p. 26.

lips of children, than whom none are more welcome at the Lord's table. It should never be put into the hands of those "who are practically unable to avoid excess if they use wine at all," * much less should it be put to the lips of one in whom the simple taste, and sometimes even the mere smell of alcohol awakens a dormant or conquered appetite, and becomes the initial step to a course of headlong dissipation and irremediable ruin.† Yet such has been the sad history of not a few souls.‡ Can it be that He who taught his disciples to pray "Lead us not into temptation," has made his memorial table a place of overmastering temptation to any, and of possible danger to all?

c. "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi, 28; Mark xiv, 24, omits "for the remission of sins;" Luke xxii, 20, also omits this clause, and reads, "which is shed for you;" 1 Cor. xi, 25, omits both these clauses.) Up to this moment the blood of bulls and of goats had represented the blood of Christ; henceforth the wine of the Supper was to stand as its symbol. (Heb. ix, 13, 14.) But we undertake to say that fermented wine could not suitably serve this purpose. It is not a proper symbol of blood in general. Its only possible resemblance to blood is its color. But that characteristic does not pertain to it exclusively, and the point of the symbolism, as Meyer has shown,§ does not lie in the color. In every other particular, the argument is altogether with the unfermented

* Prof. Bumstead, "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 92.

† "Alcohol is a veritable physical demon, which, once introduced into the blood of many a reformed inebriate, even after the lapse of a long term of strict sobriety, may rage through his veins like a consuming fire, and hurry him into the lowest depths of his long-abandoned and sincerely-repented-of sin. . . It is difficult for any one inexperienced in the treatment of dipsomania to realize the truth. But so real is the danger, that, Churchman as I am, even when a drinker myself, I never allowed any reformed drunkard to go near a communion-table where an intoxicating liquor was presented. In this practice I am supported by Dr. Richardson, Dr. Fergus, Surgeon-General Francis, and other experts in the higher ranks of the medical profession. I would as soon have thought of putting a loaded pistol in the hands of a maniac in a lucid interval, bidding him take care not to shoot himself." Dr. Norman Kerr, in "Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical," pp. 98, 99, who cites the very positive testimony of the above-mentioned physicians on the subject.

‡ *Vide* testimony of Dr. Duffield in "Bible Rule of Temperance," p. 134.

§ "Comm." on Matt. xxvi, 28.

wine, as so eminent an authority as Dr. B. W. Richardson has pointed out. He says:

> The constituent parts actually of blood and of the expressed wine are strikingly analogous. One of the most important elements of the blood, that which keeps it together, that which Plato speaks of as the "plastic parts of the blood," is the fibrine, and that is represented in the gluten of the unfermented wine. If we come to the nourishing part of the blood, that which we call the mother of the tissues, we find it in the unfermented grape, in the albumen, and that is also present in the blood; and if we come to all the salts, there they are in the blood, and the proportion is nearly the same in the unfermented wine as in the blood; and if we come to the unfermented parts of the wine which go to support the respiration of the body, we find them in the sugar. Really and truly, on a question of symbolism, if there be any thing at all in that, the argument is all in favor of the use of unfermented wine.*

Again, fermented wine cannot be a proper symbol of *Christ's* blood. The warm current which pulsates in human veins is not pure. It has been tainted by sin. This taint is the accumulated heritage of generations of transgressors. And a wine in which some trace of fermentation had begun the work of corruption might not unfitly represent such blood. But the blood of Christ was absolutely pure. There was no touch or taint of sin in his veins. "He whom God raised again saw no corruption," (Acts xiii, 37,) either in life or in death. And of the contents of the eucharistic cup he declared "this is *my* blood." Then it was pure, as fresh and uncontaminated as the clustered drops within the unburst grape.† Again, fermented wine cannot be an appropriate symbol of Christ's blood as the means of man's redemption and sanctification. Such "a defunct and deleterious liquor" could be a proper emblem only of depravity and death. While "the fresh juice of the cluster,

* From an address delivered at a select conference in London after a paper by Dr. Norman Kerr, on "Wines, Scriptural and Ecclesiastical." "National Temperance Advocate," March, 1882, p. 37.

† It may be regarded as a strong confirmation of this view of the case, that in every instance where Christ alone was typified in the sacrifices, offerings, and feasts of the Old Testament, the use of leaven, the element and emblem of corruption, was prohibited, as in the trespass offering (Lev. vi, 17,) and the meat offering, (Lev. ii, 11;) while in those instances where God's people were typified, as in the two loaves which constituted the meat offering of the feast of Pentecost, (Lev. xxiii, 17,) the use of leaven was enjoined.

full of inimitable life," fitly signifies the blessings of salvation and immortal joy which the blood of Christ bestows. That blood is said to purge the conscience, (Heb. ix, 14;) but fermented wine stimulates to unnatural activity all the physical powers and awakens all the baser passions of the soul. The unfermented wine, however, is a gentle purgative and a genuine nutrient, and is every way adapted to promote the health and happiness of man.

The expression, "which was shed for many," is especially suggestive in this connection. The word is *ἐκχυννόμενον*, from *ἐκχύνω*, (r. *ἐκχέω*,) to pour out or shed, and is radically the same as the term *ἀρχιοινοχόος*, by which the LXX translate the Heb. שַׂר הַמַּשְׁקִים, *sar ham-mashqim*, in Gen. xl, 9, rendered (A. V.) "chief butler." The participle, moreover, is in the present tense, as is *διδόμενον*, (Luke xxii, 19,) and *κλώμενον*, (1 Cor. xi, 24,) used in speaking of "the bread," and which we may suppose were uttered in immediate connection with the act of "breaking" and "giving" it to the disciples: "This is my body which is being broken and is being given to you." So we may conceive that on this solemn occasion our Lord, acting as the *archioinochoos*, took the purple clusters and pressed their rich juice into the cup, suiting, as he did so, the action to the word, and saying: "This is my blood in the New Testament which is being poured out for you." *

It may be urged that this interpretation is inconsistent with the fact that the passover occurred six months after the vintage. But in grape-growing countries the art of preserving the fruit for lengthened periods in a fresh state and with flavor unimpaired, is thoroughly understood and generally practiced. Josephus' testimony (Bel. Jud., vii, 8, 4) has already been given. † Niebuhr says that "the Arabs preserve grapes by hanging them up in their cellars, and eat them almost through the whole year." ‡ Swinburne quotes from an Arabic manuscript of the fourteenth century, preserved in the Library of the Escurial, which says that the people of Granada "have the secret of preserving grapes sound and juicy from one season to

* Meyer says (Comm. *in loc.*,) the whole point of the symbolism lay in *the being poured out.*

† "Methodist Quarterly Review," April, 1882, p. 299.

‡ "Travels through Arabia," Heron's translation, 1792, i, 406.

another."* Bernier says grapes were sent from Persia to India, wrapped in cotton, two hundred years ago, and sold there throughout the year.† Dr. Robinson states that "grapes at Damascus ripen early in July, and are said to be found in the market during eight months."‡ Secretary Mounsey, of the British Embassy in Vienna, writes that in a village near Sultania, in Persia, he "had a great treat to-day in the shape of some grapes. In this dry atmosphere they can be kept, it seems, for almost any length of time."§ Signor Peppini, one of the largest wine manufacturers of Italy, informed Mr. E. C. Delevan, in 1839, that "he had then in his lofts, for the use of his table until the next vintage, a quantity of grapes sufficient to make one hundred gallons of wine."‖ Dr. Kerr says: "A friend of mine now in Britain not long since unpacked grapes he had received eleven months previously from the continent, finding them fresh and good."¶ We can buy such foreign grapes, packed in cork-dust, at almost any fruit stand or first-class grocery store in this country. All travelers, moreover, bear witness to the ease with which meats and fruits are preserved for almost any length of time in the clear and dry atmosphere of Palestine. The suggested inconsistency, therefore, does not exist. Freshly kept grapes might readily have been procured for the purpose of the Last Supper.**

d. "But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine—" (Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25; Luke xxii, 18.) It is a noteworthy fact that nowhere in the New Testament is the word *οἶνος* used with reference to the Lord's Supper. After noticing the use of this term in John ii, 10; Eph. v, 18, etc., Prof. Bumstead says: "The fact is not without significance that in these passages the sacred writers did *not* use the only Greek word which clearly refers to an unfermented liquid, namely, *γλεῦκος*."†† And so we say, the fact is not without significance that in speaking of the wine of the

* "Travels Through Spain," London, 1787, i, 260.
† "Travels in Mogul," London, 1826, i, 284.
‡ "Biblical Researches," 1856, iii, 453.
§ "The Caucasus and Persia," London, 1872, p. 117.
‖ "Temperance Bible Commentary," p. 278.
¶ "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 30.
** *Vide* quotation from Dr. Peabody, *supra*, p. 79, latter part.
†† "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 80.

Supper the sacred writers did not use the Greek word which these authors assert always refers to a fermented liquid, namely, *οἶνος*. Instead of so doing, we find them employing an expression which cannot by any legitimate method of interpretation be made to mean a fermented article.* Two terms are used and two only. One, which we have already considered, is used figuratively; the cup is put for its contents, but indicates nothing as to their character. The other we regard as decisive of the point in question. Christ calls the contents of that cup "the fruit of the vine," *γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου*. *Γέννημα*, from *γεννάω*, to beget, or produce, signifies in classic and in Hellenistic Greek a *natural* product in its natural state, just as it is gathered and garnered. This is its signification in Polybius, i, 71, 1; iii, 87, 1, and in Diodorus Siculus, v, 17; in the LXX, Gen. xli, 34; xlvii, 24; and Exod. xxiii, 10; also in the New Testament, Luke xii, 18. In each of these instances it is equivalent to *κάρπος*, "the natural fruit, usually of trees, but sometimes of the earth." In the case before us it could have no proper or possible application but to the juice of the grape in its natural state just as it came from the cluster. It must mean, if it mean wine at all, a purely unfermented wine. Fermented wine is not "the fruit of the vine." It is the fruit of disintegration and decay. "Alcoholic wine, then, is no more entitled to be called 'the fruit of the vine' than any of the other contemporaneous or subsequent products of its decay, such as carbonic acid, vinegar, yeast, volatile oils, œnanthic acid, or ammonia. To apply the phrase, 'fruit of the vine' to any of the substances resulting from its decay, is just the same absurdity as to call death the fruit of life."† We cannot doubt that Jesus, with divine wisdom, selected this term to designate the contents of the memorial cup, that in

* "Considering how often the New Testament writers mention the Supper, their entire avoidance of all the current names for wine, in that connection, affords some reason for holding that they designed to avoid them. It is not an unnatural suggestion that they may have designated what was in 'the cup' as 'the fruit of the vine,' expressly to distinguish it from that fermented preparation of grape-juice commonly known as wine. If we take the evidence of the Bible, separate from Jewish and patristic tradition, this certainly seems to be the one salient point in the case." Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., in "The Presbyterian Review," April, 1882, p. 322.

† Dr. Lees, in "Text-Book of Temperance," p. 50.

after times no sanction might be found in his words for the use of a beverage manifestly unfit for the purposes of the holy sacrament.

It is worthy of notice that the word ἄμπελος, vine, is used in only two connections in the narratives of the life of Christ. We find it in the instance just cited, and also in the report of our Lord's farewell address to his disciples, preserved in John xv, 1, 4, 5. That address, as we know, was given on this very occasion of the Last Supper, (John xiii, 1, f.) What suggested the strikingly appropriate figure which it contains, of the vine and its branches? Several theories have been proposed. Among others, Dr. Geikie* says: "Perhaps the thought rose from the sight of the wine-cup on the table, and its recent use at the evening feast; or perhaps the house stood amid vines, and the branches may have been trained around the windows; or the vineyard itself may have lain below in the bright moonlight." But it is far more probable, as it seems to us, that the idea of this happy comparison was suggested by the crushed clusters that lay upon the table about which they still lingered.

e. "Until that day when I drink it new (καινόν) with you in my Father's kingdom," (Matt. xxvi, 29; Mark xiv, 25. Luke says merely, "Until the kingdom of God shall come," xxii, 18.) Those who oppose our position understand Christ in this passage to be contrasting the *old wine* which he was then drinking with the *new wine* which he was to drink with his disciples in the coming kingdom. But such an interpretation, implying, as it unquestionably does, the superiority of the *new* wine, is in direct contradiction to the construction which these same scholars insist upon putting on Luke v, 39, already considered. So that they may safely be left to answer themselves. Far more reasonable is the interpretation which takes καινόν as an adverbial accusative, and renders, not drink *new* wine, but drink it *anew*.† But much better than either is the construction which regards, as the others do not, the distinction between καινός and νέος. The latter term would signify simply wine new in time, as of a recent vintage; the

* "Life and Words of Christ," ii, 484. Dr. Macdonald makes a similar suggestion in "The Life and Writings of St. John," p. 353, note.

† So Theophylact, Kuinoel, Rosenmüller, Bloomfield, Abbott, *et al.*

latter means wine new in quality or character.* In this sense the word is nearly equivalent to ἕτερος, different. This appears from Mark xvi, 17, where καιναὶ γλῶσσαι "does not express the recent commencement of this miraculous speaking with tongues, but the unlikeness of these tongues to any that went before, therefore called also ἕτεραι γλῶσσαι, (Acts ii, 4,) 'tongues different from any hitherto known.'"† This use of the word is illustrated in Xenophon, (Mem. I., 1, 3.) ὁ δὲ οὐδὲν καινότερον εἰσέφερε τῶν ἄλλων, "he introduced nothing of a different nature from the rest." The term is frequently employed with this signification in the New Testament, as in the passage immediately preceding the one under consideration. The "new covenant" of Matt. xxvi, 28, is a covenant of a widely different nature from the former. So the "new creature," καινὴ κτίσις, of 2 Cor. v, 17, and Gal. vi, 15, and the "new man," καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, of Eph. iv, 24, and Col. iii, 10, denote a creature and a character of another type altogether. The term is employed in this sense especially, as in the present instance, with reference to "the future renovation of all things"‡ predicted by Christ, (Rev. xxi, 5,) "Behold I make all things new, (καινά.)" Thus we read of the "new song," ᾠδὴ καινή, (Rev. v, 9; xiv, 3;) the "new name," ὄνομα καινόν, (Rev. ii, 17; iii, 12;) "the new heaven and the new earth," οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν, (2 Pet. iii, 13; Rev. xxi, 1;) and "the new Jerusalem," ἡ καινὴ Ἱερουσαλήμ, (Rev. iii, 12; xxi, 2)—all of them signifying something of an entirely different nature from any thing which has preceded.

We understand, therefore, by this "new wine" of the coming kingdom a wine which, like that kingdom itself, will be of a kind and character utterly unknown to earth, a spiritual wine as it is to be a spiritual kingdom.§ It is, perhaps, not unreasonable to suppose that it will be identical with what is elsewhere called "the *water* of life," (Rev. xxi, 6; xxii, 1, 17.) The allusion of Christ, in this instance, was undoubtedly suggested, not by the presence of an old and fermented liquor at the feast, but by the contents of the cup from which he had

* So Bengel, Meyer, Clarke, Mansel, Nast, *et al.*

† Trench, "Synonyms of the New Testament," Part II, § 10, *q. v*

‡ *Vide* Robinson, "Lexicon of the New Testament," *s. v.*

§ Ellicott, "Comm. on Matthew," *in loc.*

just drank, and in which was the freshly expressed juice of the cluster, so beautifully typical of "the newness of life," καινότης ζωῆς, (Rom. vi, 4,) which men have in him.

iii. *The practice of those by whom this rite was perpetuated* is corroborative of our position that the wine used at its institution was unfermented. But issue is straightway joined with this statement, and the conduct of the Corinthians, as described in 1 Cor. xi, 20, 21, is cited in refutation. This passage, indeed, is the main reliance of those who insist that the wine of the Last Supper was alcoholic. Dr. Moore returns to it again and again, in the course of his two articles, to prove "that the sacramental cup containing 'the fruit of the vine' could certainly intoxicate those who were guilty of the sin of drinking it immoderately."* Dr. Poor also asks, "Is not this a valid argument in proof of the fact that the wine used at the Lord's Supper, in the primitive Church, was such as could intoxicate?"† By no means, we answer. The record in question does not refer to the Lord's Supper at all, but to the agapæ, or love-feasts, which were often associated with it.‡ But "this is *not* to eat the Lord's Supper," (1 Cor. xi, 20,) the apostle distinctly declares. "Paul rebuked the Corinthians for getting drunk when they did *not* eat the Lord's Supper," Prof. Beecher remarks;§ and then, with justifiable sarcasm, inquires, "Does it not follow, by irresistible inference, that when they *did* eat it, they used a wine capable of making them drunk?" And he is correct in saying, "This is not a caricature of the argument from this passage. It is the argument itself, and the whole of it." But, supposing this reference was to the Lord's Supper, we have already shown‖ that the natural and necessary rendering of its language is, "One is hungry and another is surfeited." And even if we were compelled to concede such a reference, and to translate, as in the A. V., "drunken," it would then merely indicate that at that early date *this* Church had departed from the original custom of the feast, had surreptitiously introduced intoxicating liquor, and

* "Presbyterian Review," January, 1882, p. 95.

† Lange, "Commentary," *in loc.*

‡ *Vide* p. 60, *supra;* also, Commentaries of Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown, Dr. Cowles, and other authorities.

§ "Presbyterian Review," April, 1882, p. 322.

‖ "Methodist Quarterly Review," July, 1882, p. 477.

had turned the holy sacrament into a drunken revel. It is certain that their sin, whatever it was, whether selfish surfeiting or riotous drinking, and wherever committed, whether at the agapæ or the Eucharist, drew down upon them the unsparing condemnation of the apostle. It still further appears that some of the Corinthian church members had even dared attend the festivals of the heathen gods, (1 Cor. x, 19, f.,) and drink of the intoxicating wines which flowed so freely on those occasions. That drink St. Paul denounced as "the cup of devils," (1 Cor. x, 21,) and put it in startling contrast with "the cup of the Lord," (1 Cor. x, 21,) which he had just called "the cup of blessing," (v, 16,) and which, with all the force of the comparison, is shown to be a totally different thing, an innocent and unintoxicating drink.

In pursuing an inquiry as to the practice of the early Church in this matter, it is necessary to bear in mind and give due weight to one fact, namely: deviations from the primitive simplicity and purity of Christianity and its institutions began almost immediately, and perpetuated themselves inveterately. Abuses and corruptions crept into the Church, gradually at first, but rapidly afterward, always obscuring, and often wholly obliterating the original intentions of its Founder. In no instance was this tendency to perversion earlier or more extensively manifested than in that of the Lord's Supper.* Before the close of the third century we find this ordinance corrupted from a spiritual service into a sacerdotal act; the plain table converted into a priestly altar; the simple elements changed into sacrificial offerings and made the objects of adoration; and the eucharistic feast transformed into an expiatory rite.† Another century had not passed before the keynote of the doctrine of transubstantiation had been struck by Ambrose and Chrysostom,‡ a doctrine which was dogmatically decreed by the fourth Lateran Council in the thirteenth century. Two centuries later the practice of withholding the cup from the laity, which for three hundred years had been extending, was authoritatively established by the Council of Constance, (A. D. 1415.) Now it would not be strange if, amid all these mani-

* *Vide* Stanley's "Christian Institutions," Harper's ed., chap. iii, *passim.*

† *Vide* Pressensé, "Christian Life in the Early Church," book II, *passim.*

‡ Pope, "Compendium of Theology," iii, 329.

fold and monstrous corruptions of the primitive Supper, we should find that the simple juice of the grape, consecrated by Christ to this service, had been displaced by an altogether different and utterly inappropriate material. We know that the other element, the bread of common life such as Christ used, has been, by the greater part of Christendom and for ages, without rebuke or dissent, degraded into the smallest particle of paste, known as "the wafer." * The Roman Church, by whom all these abuses have been introduced and perpetuated, place the intoxicating cup upon their ecclesiastically restricted altar. And Protestantism, it must with shame be confessed, has not as yet very generally freed itself from this "relic of Popery." But how was it in the early ages of the Church? Some traces of adherence to the original custom certainly remain. One of the most important is found in the apocryphal "Acts and Martyrdom of Matthew," which was current in the second and third centuries of the Christian era.† A passage in this work reads, (Sec. 25 :) ‡ *Καὶ προσενέγκατε προσφορὰν ἄρτον ἅγιον καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμπέλου τρεῖς βότρυας ἀποθλίψαντες ἐν ποτηρίῳ συγκοινωνήσατέ μοι, ὡς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ὑπέδειξεν τὴν ἄνω προσφορὰν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν*, "Bring ye also as an offering holy bread, and, having pressed three clusters from the vine into a cup, communicate with me, as the Lord Jesus showed us how to offer up when he rose from the dead on the third day." This is clear and positive testimony as to the use of the freshly expressed juice of the grape in the celebration of the Lord's Supper at that primitive period. The view which the early Church took of the bread and wine of the holy communion, as offerings of the first-fruits of the earth,§ and the canon of the African Church requiring the offerings from which the bread and wine for the great communion at Easter were prepared to be of unground wheat and unpressed grapes, (*ἀπὸ σταφυλῶν καὶ σίτου*,) ‖ both point to the use of a fresh and unfermented wine. That the practice of pressing the grapes directly into the cup at the Supper was preserved,

* Stanley, "Christian Institutions," Harper's ed., p. 43.

† *Vide* Prolegomena to "The Apocryphal Acts and Epistles" in Clarke's "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

‡ "Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha," edidit C. Tischendorf. Leipsiae, 1851, p. 184.

§ Irenæus, (*Adv. Haeres.*, iv, 17, 18,) *offere primitias Deo ex suis creaturis.*

‖ Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church," xv, 2, 3.

is still further apparent from the action of the third Council of Braga, (A. D. 675,) which relates Cyprian's words, correcting several other abuses that were crept into the administration of this sacrament, among which it mentions *quosdam etiam expressum vinum in sacramento Dominici calicis offere*, "Some even who presented no other wine at the sacrament of the Lord's cup but what they pressed out of the clusters of grapes."* Let it be noticed that this fresh juice is called *vinum*, wine; that the charge is brought by a Church which had itself completely corrupted the ordinance; and that the gravamen of the charge is not that the wine is unfermented, but that it is unmixed with water.† That objection, however, had been met three centuries before by Pope Julius I., (A. D. 337,) in a decree which read:‡ *Sed si necesse sit, botrus in calice comprimatur et aqua misceatur*, "But if necessary let the cluster be pressed into the cup and water mingled with it." This decree is quoted as authoritative by Durandus in the thirteenth century, who says:§ *Botrus ante uvae in necessitate comprimi et inde confici potest; sed de ipso botro non compresso non potest communicari*, "In case of necessity the cluster may be pressed beforehand and the sacrament made therefrom; but with the unpressed cluster communion cannot be had." Thomas Aquinas, in the same century, also cited and confirmed this seventh decree of Julius, and added his testimony to the lawfulness and propriety of using unfermented wine at the sacrament:‖ *Mustum autem jam habet speciem vini . . . ideo de musto potest confici hoc sacramentum*, "Must has the specific nature of wine, therefore this sacrament can be kept with must." In the "Manipulus Curatorum"¶ (1333) we are likewise informed that the sacrament may be celebrated in *mustum*. Similarly, Jacobus à Vitriaco, a cen-

* Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church," xv, 2, 3.

† The practice of mingling the wine with water, noticed by Justyn Martyr, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Gregory of Nyassa, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Theodoret, and many other Greek and Roman writers, would have its origin, not necessarily in the weakening of alcoholic wine, but in the thinning of boiled wines and the thick juices of the crushed clusters.

‡ Gratian, Pars. III, "De Consecr," Dist. ii, c. vii.

§ "Ration. Div. Off." Lugd., 1505, L. iv, c. xli, n. 10.

‖ Pars. III, Quæst. lxxiv, Art. 5.

¶ Pars. I, tr. iv, c. iii, fol. xxii, 2. London, 1509.

tury before, had said:* "The sacrament may be made of *mustum*, though it be sweet, for it is wine." Dionysius Barsalibi testified to the same effect:† *In necessitate sumatur uvarum succus, aut ex uvis passis liquor expressus . . . cum isto Liturgia celebrari potest*, "In necessity let the juice of grapes be taken, or the liquor expressed from dried grapes; . . . with this the sacrament may be celebrated." In the twelfth century Johannes Belethus called attention to the practice of observing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the freshly expressed juice of the grape on the Day of Transfiguration. He says:‡: *Notemus quidem Christi sanguinem eadem hac die confici ex novo vino, si inveniri potest, aut aliquantulum ex matura uva in calicem expressa*, "Let us notice that on this same day the blood of Christ is set forth from new wine, if it can be found, or from ripe grapes expressed into the cup." Durandus mentions the sacramental use of such wine on the 6th of August, under like circumstances, as a custom *nota in quibusdam locis*, "well known in certain places."§ The evidence of ecclesiastical history on this subject, so far as the Latin Church is concerned, is well summed up by Scudamore, who says:‖ "In the case of necessity, the expressed juice has always been held to be wine for the purpose of the sacrament."

Within the pale of the Oriental Churches, where Christianity was earliest established, and has, in many respects, been preserved in greatest purity,¶ we find proofs of the long-established use of unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper. This is true of the Abyssinian Church, which is, in all probability, the lineal descendant of that founded by the first Ethiopian convert, (Acts viii, 27.) According to the traveler Bruce,** "The Abyssinians receive the holy sacrament in both kinds, in unleavened bread and in grapes bruised with the husk together as it grows." Bishop Gobat, of Jerusalem, bears similar tes-

* "Hist. Occid.," c. xxxviii, p. 423.

† Renaudot, "Lit. Orient." Paris, 1716, Coll. i, p. 194.

‡ Migne, "Patrol. C. C.," v. 202.

§ "Ration. Div. Off." Ludg., 1565, L. vii, c. xxii.

‖ "Notitia Eucharistica." London, 1876, p. 771.

¶ "The Greek Churches are more tenacious of ancient usage than the Latin." Stanley, "Christian Institutions," Harper's ed., p. 43.

** "Travels in Abyssinia," Halifax, 1840, p. 245.

timony as to the practice of this Church.* It is, in fact, conceded on all sides, and has undoubtedly been the common custom of that body of Christians from the earliest times.† The same may be said of the Coptic Church, which Dean Stanley calls "the most primitive and conservative of all Christian Churches."‡ Tischendorf, in his narrative of a visit to the Coptic monasteries of Egypt in 1846, writes:§ "Instead of wine they used a thick juice of the grape, which I at first mistook for oil." The Christians of St. John who dwell along the Jordan valley, and claim to have received the Gospel from the Apostle John, according to the testimony of Baron Tavernier in the seventeenth century, used wine from dried grapes steeped in water, "in the consecration of the cup."‖ Similarly Thevenot says of this people,¶ "As for the wine of their consecration, they make use of wine drawn from dried grapes steeped in water, which they express; and they use the same wine for moistening the flour whereof they make the host." The Christians of St. Thomas on the Malabar coast in the south of India, who are an offshoot from the ancient Christian Church of Persia, follow a like custom. Duarté Barbosa, in the beginning of the sixteenth century, writes that they celebrate the Lord's Supper in the juice expressed from raisins "softened one night in water."** Bishop Osorius also testifies concerning these Christians:†† *Vino ex passis uvis confecto in sacrificiis utuntur*, "They use wine prepared from dried grapes in their sacrifices." Brerewood,‡‡ Ross,§§ Nelson,‖‖ and other authorities furnish additional evidence to the same effect. The Nestorians of Western Asia, who date back as a sect to the fifth century, likewise employ the expressed juice of dried grapes in their celebration of the Eucharist. Ainsworth,

* "Journal of a Sojourn in Abyssinia in 1834." London, 1834, pp. 223, 345.

† *Vide* Alvarez, "Itin. Æthiop.," in Renaudot, "Lit. Orient." coll. i, p. 193.

‡ "Christian Institutions," Harper's ed., p. 52.

§ "Travels in the East." Ed. by Shuckard. London, 1847, p. 50.

‖ "Travels in Persia," London, 1677. L. iii, c. 8, p. 90.

¶ "Travels in the Levant." London, 1687, Pars. ii, p. 164.

** Stanley in Hakluyt, "Description of East Africa and Malabar." London, 1866, p. 163.

†† "De Rebus," Olysipp, 1571, p. 143.

‡‡ "Division of Languages." London, 1614, p. 147.

§§ "Pansebeia." London, 1653, xiv, p. 508.

‖‖ "Fasts and Festivals," c. iv, p. 48.

in the account of his travels among that people in 1840,* records that "raisin water supplied the place of wine," the bishop administering the sacrament. Such is some of the evidence which we have of the use of unfermented wine in the observance of the Lord's Supper in the Churches both of the East and of the West, from the earliest periods of Christian history down to the present time.

We conclude, therefore, from our inquiry into the primitive character, connections, and customs of this ordinance, that our Lord did not use a fermented wine at its institution, nor did he command such an article to be employed in its enjoined observance throughout the centuries which were to come. On the contrary, every thing points to the use and sanction of the simple, unfermented, nutritious juice of the grape.

It remains for us to consider

II. Christ's use of wine on the cross.—The slight variations in the record of this event as given by the four evangelists are only such as prove the independence of the authors and the originality of their accounts. They do not in any wise render uncertain the fact that two very different draughts were offered our Saviour amid his last sufferings.

i. A drugged drink was proffered him, and promptly rejected. Both Matthew and Mark agree as to this. The other evangelists make no reference to it. Matthew calls the potion (xxvii, 34) "vinegar mixed with gall," *ὄξον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον.*† Mark terms it (xv, 23) "wine mingled with myrrh," *ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον.* The latter uses the generic word for wine; the former calls it by its specific name in this instance. Matthew copies his phraseology from the LXX, (Psa. lxix, 21.) The term *χολή*, gall, does not describe the animal secretion, but some bitter and narcotic herb, such as wormwood, poppy, myrrh, or even hemlock or mandragora.‡ It is used with this general sense in Deut. xxix, 18; Psa. lxix, 21; and Prov. v, 4. The mixture may have been one commonly administered to criminals at their execution to alleviate their sufferings. Some of the rabbis understood Prov. xxxi, 6, 7, as an injunction to

*"Travels in Asia Minor." London, 1842, ii, p. 210.

† The R. V., following Codices Aleph, B, and D, has wine (*οἶνον*) instead of vinegar (*ὄξον*). With this reading the Vulgate agrees, having *vinum.*

‡ Ellicott, "Comm.," *in loc.*

such works of mercy.* There are said to be traces of the existence of a society at Jerusalem which made this its especial duty.† Possibly in the present instance the draught was proffered the Saviour by the women alluded to in Luke xxiii, 27. But, however compounded, or by whomsoever presented, "when he had tasted thereof he would not drink." (Matt. xxvii, 34; Mark xv, 23.) The fact that he did not reject this potion until he had tasted it, indicated his willingness to receive any simple liquid to allay his thirst. He refused to drink this, because it was stupefying, and would have dimmed his consciousness and diminished the fullness of his sufferings. He deliberately chose to finish his mission in the full possession of his powers. Whatever may have been the nature of the *οἶνος* with which the *χολή* was mixed, the draught was rejected, not on account of the former, but of the latter ingredient. The act, therefore, does not bear directly upon the question under consideration. If it has any lesson for us, it is that we are not to seek a cowardly escape from the pains and trials of life in the stupefying drug or in the intoxicating cup. But afterward

ii. A drink of simple *ὄξος* was offered Christ and was accepted by him. Whether this was done twice, once in mockery, (Luke xxiii, 36,) and then later, in kindness, (Matt. xxvii, 48; Mark xv, 36; John xix, 29,)‡ or whether the four evangelists all narrate the same incident, is not important to our inquiry. Only John (xix, 30,) tells us directly that Jesus received the potion; but the language of the others, unless it be Luke's, is consistent with such an interpretation. If it should appear on investigation that this drink was a fermented and intoxicating article, as Dr. Moore would have us understand that it was,§ in order that he may thus convict Christ

* So Lightfoot and Schoettgen, ("Hor. Heb.," Leips., 1733, p. 236.) An attempt is made to explain the above passage as a command of this sort by some scholars of to-day. But Christ's refusal of this potion is sufficient proof "that the spirit that was in him" could never have sanctioned such a practice. That spirit points to prayer and not to drink as a refuge from the ills of life. (James v, 13.) Prov. xxxi, 6, 7, is, doubtless, to be understood as a satirical and ironical command, similar to Amos iv, 5, "Offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving *with leaven*."

† Ellicott, "Comm.," *in loc.*, who refers to Deutsch's "Essays," p. 38.

‡ So Lightfoot, Alford, Ellicott, Whedon, etc.

§ "Presbyterian Review," January, 1882, p. 86.

of actually using fermented liquor during passover week, (!) it would argue nothing as to his total abstinence principles, or as to our duty in this direction. It was taken under circumstances so utterly exceptional, the only possible analogy to which in our own case would be the medicinal use of stimulants, which we are not discussing, and that, too, administered when the work of life was done, and nothing remained but to soothe the dying agonies, that no inference could be drawn from it touching the subject in question.

But even this was not the case. The drink Christ received in his expiring moments was not alcoholic or intoxicating. Each of the four evangelists call it ὄξος, and in each case it is rendered (A. V. and R. V.) "vinegar." The term describes a drink which corresponded to the *chometz* of the Hebrews and the *acetum* of the Romans. It was a wine which had completed the acetous stage of fermentation, and was sour to a proverb, (Prov. x, 26.) The degree of its acidity may be inferred from Prov. xxv, 20, where its effect upon niter (carbonate of soda) is observed. By itself it formed a nauseous draught, (Psa. lxix, 21.) It was serviceable for the purpose of sopping bread as used by laborers, (Ruth ii, 14.) To this day the harvesters in Italy and the Peninsula use a similar article called *sera* and *pesca*.* In hot climates it formed, when diluted, a very refreshing draught,† like the buttermilk which is so favorite a beverage in our own South. By the Romans this wine was usually mixed with water, and was then termed *posca*.‡ It was not intoxicating.§ It was the regular beverage of the Roman soldiery when on duty.‖ A jar of this drink, which the soldiers had brought to sustain them in their long day's service, stood near the cross. When the suffering Saviour cried "I thirst" some one of their number, touched by rude pity, took the sponge, which had probably served instead of a cork to the jar, and lifted it to his parched lips. When he had received it, "he said, It is finished, and he bowed his head and gave up the ghost." (John xix, 30.) In

* Kitto, "Biblical Cyclopedia," art. "Wine."

† Pliny, "N. H.," xxiii, 26, cf. ii, 49. ‡ *Ibid.*, xix, 29.

§ *Vide* Plautus, ("Mil. Glor.," iii, 2, 23:)

Alii ebrii sunt, alii poscam potitant,

"Some are drunk, while others are drinking vinegar-water."

‖ Vegetius, De Re Mil., iv, 7; Spartianus, Hadr. 10.

this transaction, well nigh too awful for our most reverent contemplation, we find no warrant for the imputation that Jesus ever tasted of the intoxicating cup.

We have now completed our detailed examination of all the specifications of the charge which men, for nearly two thousand years, have brought against Christ, of using and sanctioning the use of fermented liquors as a beverage, and have found absolutely nothing to sustain them. On the other hand, all the evidence in the case, when carefully investigated and candidly interpreted, points to and sustains the entirely different conclusion, that Jesus was a total abstainer from all that could intoxicate, and gave no sanction to the use of alcoholic drinks by others under any circumstances.

We might rest our argument right here; but the discussion would not be complete without some consideration of what we may call

V. The Positive Argument.

There is very much in the teachings of our Lord which bears immediately and authoritatively on the duty of total abstinence. We find this both in

1. *The General Principles*, and
2. *The Particular Precepts*

which he laid down for the guidance of human conduct. We shall examine these separately.

1. *General Principles.* The greater part of Christ's instructions were of this character. He dealt but seldom with the minor details of duty. He made no attempt to cover every possible exigency by particular precepts. There were many wicked customs of his own day which he did not in express terms forbid. So far as the record shows, he did not speak a single word directly against slave-holding, polygamy, or gambling. And yet no one doubts that the whole tendency of his spirit, example, and teaching was to condemn and eradicate these practices. Neither did he attempt to provide specifically against evils which might arise for the first time in subsequent ages. To have done so with any exactness would have been to suggest the very wrongs he sought to correct. To have done so obscurely or ambiguously would have been to render the whole unintelligible and inoperative. For instance, had Christ forbidden by name the use of fermented liquors, which were

the only kind of intoxicants known to his day, it would probably have been construed as a virtual permission to use distilled liquors, which were not discovered until twelve centuries later. At least, men would have been very likely to claim exemption for these, or have reached them only indirectly and by inference. If he had explicitly anticipated the discovery of alcohol, and included the stronger beverages of modern times in his prohibitions, it would have confused the whole command, or precipitated the very evils against which it was intended to guard. In such a case one general principle would be worth any number of specific enactments. So in a multitude of other instances. Christ did not forbid the habitual use of opium, hasheesh, or arsenic. But he enunciated laws of personal duty which cover these and every other form of sinful indulgence. And so for the whole conduct of life he has established grand, comprehensive principles which are capable of an ever-varying adjustment to its changing circumstances and needs. As another has well said, "They are catholic in their character and adaptations, and are at all times in advance of the highest attainable morality." * No exigency of the present and no contingency of the future can exhaust their significance or exceed their application. These great principles, when impartially applied, enforce the duty of total abstinence. It is difficult to understand how any unprejudiced mind can come into contact with the teachings of Christ without recognition of this truth. When the parliament of Tahiti consulted the queen concerning the admission of intoxicating liquors into the realm, she replied: "Let the principles contained in the New Testament be the foundation of all your proceedings." They straightway enacted a law forbidding all trade with vessels bringing ardent spirits into their ports. The general principles of this Book, and not any one of its special texts, we are told, determined their decision. At a few of these controlling principles of human conduct, as laid down by Christ, it is now our purpose to look.

(1) The first is the Law of Self-Denial, which is announced in these terms: "If any man will (R. V. "would,") come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross and follow

* Rev. James Smith, "The Temperance Reformation and the Christian Church," p. 256.

me." (Matt. xvi, 24; Mark viii, 34; Luke ix, 23.) The self to be denied is the lower and carnal nature, whose clamorings come often into conflict with the claims of the higher and spiritual nature. Its proper regulation requires the rigid denial not only of those appetencies, which are in themselves positively vicious, but of those whose indulgence would expose to moral danger, or disqualify for Christian duty. The appetite for alcoholic beverages is justly liable to all these indictments. It is unnatural and pernicious. It craves something which the system does not need, and which it cannot receive without detriment. And in the general damage the mind suffers even more severely than the body.* The moral danger in which even its moderate use involves one will be considered under the next topic, and need only be adverted to here. It is further demonstrable that indulgence in these beverages, even to an extent far short of excess, dims the religious perceptions, deadens devotional feelings, and diminishes spiritual power. Indeed, this must inevitably follow from what has already been said of its influence on the body and on the mind.† The law of self-denial, therefore, calls for a strict abstinence from every thing of the kind. Nothing short of this can meet the demands of that law. The denial which it enjoins is of the most absolute sort. The verb rendered "to deny" is the compound *ἀπαρνησάσθω*, whose simple form, *ἀρνέομαι*, signifies "to deny, to refuse, to say No." ‡ This is greatly strengthened by the addition of the preposition,§ and then "indicates a putting away on the part of the speaker, a recoil on his part." ‖ Instances of its use with this force in the classics occur in Thucydides (vi, 56) and Plato (Rep., v, 468 c.) The LXX employ it to render the Hebrew מָאַס, *maas*, to reject or refuse, with the

* "As I have moved among those who are physically stricken with alcohol, and have detected under the various disguises of name the fatal diseases, the pains and penalties, it imposes on the body, the picture has been sufficiently cruel. But even that picture pales as I conjure up, without any stretch of imagination, the devastation which the same agent inflicts on the mind." Dr. B. W. Richardson, in "The Action of Alcohol on the Body and on the Mind," p. 57.

† This subject is very fully and ably discussed in Smith's "The Temperance Reformation and the Christian Church," c. iii.

‡ Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.*

§ Suidas, "Lexicon," *s. v.*

‖ Cremer, "Biblico-Theological Lexicon of N. T. Greek," *s. v.*

idea of loathing,* as, for example, in Isa. xxxi, 7. Origen and Jerome apply the term to abandoning vice.† It carries with it, therefore, the strongest possible sense of renunciation, and involves in this instance the absolute abandonment of all that is evil, and of every thing that is opposed to the Christian life and service.

This law of self-denial and its interpretation are re-enforced by another declaration of Christ's: "If thy right eye offend thee, (R. V., "causeth thee to stumble,") pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee, (R. V., "causeth thee to stumble,") cut it off and cast it from thee, for it is profitable for thee," etc. (Matt. v, 29, 30.) These aorists, "pluck it out," *ἔξελε*, "cut it off," *ἔκκοψον*, and "cast it from thee," *βάλε ἀπὸ σοῦ*, indicate an instantaneous, energetic, and utter abandonment of evil. The term "offends," (*σκανδαλίζει*, from *σκάνδαλον*, a trap-spring, so, literally, to entrap,) signifies in this connection to tempt to sin. It cannot be doubted that intoxicating drinks come within the scope of its definition. Dr. Richardson rightly denominates them "an agent which of all others leads men into temptation." ‡ None other is so seductive in its nature, or so fatal in its consequences. More wretchedness, shame, and sin have been consequent on the use of alcoholic beverages than on all other forms of self-indulgence. This is a proposition so abundantly proved and so universally conceded that it needs only to be stated to be accepted. But were this an "offense" of far less magnitude it would still come within the range of this precept. Were it, what so many claim that it is, not necessarily and of itself an evil, but such only in its possible abuse and unintentional results, the prohibition would still apply. "These verses," says Dr. Abbott,§ "make short work of all defenses of habits and recreations confessed to be injurious in their effects, but defended on the ground that they are not wrong *per se*. The hand and eye are not only in themselves *innocent*, they are in their right use highly important. To deprive one's self of them is both to

* Gesenius, "Lexicon," *s. v.*

† *Vide* Suicer, "Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus," i, 422.

‡ "Total Abstinence," p. 27 § Comm. *in loc.*

maim the person and to lessen one's means of usefulness."—And so much might, perhaps, be said of alcohol in its proper place as a mechanical and chemical agent, and possibly, in rare cases, as a medicinal remedy.*—"Whatever then tempts the individual or his neighbor or the community into sinful courses, *even though it be not only in itself innocent, but in its right employment important*, is to be put away until it ceases to be a source of temptation." But this law of self-denial aims at something more than the arrest of an evil after it has assumed the proportions of a habit. It strikes at it in its very incipiency. Dean Alford rightly regards verse 29 as "an admonition arising out of the truth announced in the last verse: to *withstand the first springs and occasions of evil desire, even by the sacrifice of what is most useful and dear to us.*"† And he adds: "Our Lord grounds this precept of the most rigid and decisive *self-denial* on considerations of the truest *self-interest —συμφέρει σοι,*" it is profitable to thee. No stronger enforcement of the duty of total abstinence could be employed. Nor does this mean asceticism, as Professor Bumstead‡ and many others charge. There is a radical difference between the principles on which the two practices are founded. Asceticism pretends to promote the development and dignity of the spiritual nature by the degradation and privation of the body. Total abstinence, on the other hand, seeks to secure the most perfect

* "The facts as to food, dismiss it (alcohol) as such. The facts as to medicine, confine it within boundaries so narrow that we must, in fealty to real science and right practice, hold it closely within its limits." "Alcohol as a Food and as a Medicine," in the Transactions of the International Medical Congress, at Philadelphia, Sept., 1876, by Ezra M. Hunt, M.D., p. 136.

"Speaking for myself alone, and specially guarding what I say by making the opinion purely individual, I conscientiously declare that, although I might in rare instances be obliged to substitute some other similar agent for alcohol, if it did not exist at all, there is scarcely any drug I could more easily spare. If it had never been discovered I do not believe that medical science would have suffered one iota from the absence of its direct use; and if it were never directly prescribed again I doubt whether any loss to the sick would be sustained. At the same time, on the principle of giving the 'devil his due,' even in solution alcohol must not be deposed from its right place. It is an admirable solvent of many medicinal agents; and as the starting-point for the manufacture of chloroform, ether, and other chemical medicinal substances, it is of the utmost value. But these are its legitimate, as distinguished from its injurious, applications." Dr. B. W. Richardson, in "Total Abstinence," p. 42.

† Comm. *in loc.*

‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 104.

physical health and vigor in order to the soul's largest growth in holiness and power. The ascetic rejects alcoholic beverages because they are a luxury and a comfort. The abstainer refuses them because they are a poison and a curse.

(2) The Law of the Avoidance of Temptation. This is announced in the words of Christ: (A. V. and R. V.) "Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation," (Matt. xxvi, 41; Mark xiv, 38; Luke xxii, 40, 46,) taken in connection with the prayer he taught his disciples, (A. V.,) "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil," (R. V., "the evil *one*," a very inferior rendering.) (Matt. vi, 13; Luke xi, 4.) The Greek word πειρασμόν, rendered (A. V. and R. V.) "temptation," includes "the two thoughts represented in English by trials, that is, sufferings which test or try, and temptations, allurements on the side of pleasure which tend to lead us into evil." * It is in the latter sense that the term is employed in the law we are considering. And in this sense it is strictly applicable to alcoholic beverages. It is their peculiarity that they act as a temptation to their own use and to all the vice and crime originating therein. There is a dangerous enticement in the first draught of such a liquor, and the danger deepens with every subsequent indulgence. It gradually becomes essential to enjoyment, and an unnatural and insatiable craving is created. The longer this craving is gratified the more imperious become its demands, until at length it will smother every noble sentiment, sunder every tender tie, and sweep away every strong restraint to procure its unholy gratification. Such is the natural history of the alcoholic appetite. It does not in every instance, it is true, pass through all these phases—it presents many cases of arrested development—but its constant tendency and general course is to complete the last and worst stage. Chancellor Crosby may characterize the statement that moderate drinking leads to drunkenness as "an atrocious dogma," † but it remains true, nevertheless.‡ The connection

* Ellicott, Comm. *in loc.* † "A Calm View," etc.

‡ "'Moderate drinking' is an utterly indeterminate phrase; for we must bear in mind the proof already given from the most unprejudiced authorities, not only that for a large class of persons *any* drinking means certain drunkenness, but that the vast proportion of so-called moderate drinking, though it may never produce open drunkenness, is yet genuine excess, accompanied with the substantial results of intoxication. But since all drunkards certainly began with what they

between "use" and "abuse," which he and his class are so careful to distinguish from one another, is close and genetic. "Use is the seed, and abuse is the harvest to which it tends and grows." Such is the testimony of the severest science on this point. Says Dr. Hunt:* "Strange that, because multitudes who drink moderately do not fall into drunkenness, it should be taken as axiomatic that moderate drinking has no tendency to cause excessive drinking. In this respect alcohol has the law of all its class of medicines, and of many more decided narcotics." Dr. Richardson writes:† "It is, I repeat, one of the singular physiological actions of alcohol that its very presence in the human body maintains the desire for it, and overrides the will. In this manner is instilled the desire to take more of it in those who take a little, and in this manner drunkards are produced out of moderate drinkers." The same authority also declares:‡ "Whenever a person begins to take any portion of alcohol, he starts on that journey"—from "gentle stimulation" to "dead drunkenness"—"starts just as distinctly with the first drop swallowed as he would start with the first step he would put forward in a walk from the pure region of Hampstead Heath into the outfall of that Babylonish sewage, which greets the smiling Thames at Barking Creek."

At the very entrance to the path of alcoholic indulgence, therefore, Christ writes his law. He places the prohibition at the outset, for there the danger begins. He forbids us to cross the threshold of temptation. His word of warning is, "Enter not." The only safety for any, the single duty for all, is abstinence. That is the one possible application of the Law of the Avoidance of Temptation so far as alcoholic drinks are concerned.

The two principles thus far considered concern our personal duties, those which we owe to ourselves. There is another

at least considered a moderate use, (and it would seem hard in such an open question not to concede them the right to their own opinion,) it is difficult to see whence the great army of drunkards and the vast evils of drunkenness come, except from those who begin with such use. That all who drink moderately do not become drunkards does not alter the fact that all drunkards were first moderate drinkers, and therefore that moderate drinking tends to drunkenness." Rev. Daniel Merriman, in "The Bibliotheca Sacra," Oct., 1881, p. 739.

* "The New York Independent," Feb. 3, 1881.

† "Total Abstinence," p. 65.

‡ "Moderate Drinking," p. 29.

covering our relative duties, those which we owe to others. It is

(3) The Law of Love. It reads: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. xix, 19; xxii, 39; Mark xii, 31; Luke x, 27; Rom. xiii, 9; Gal. v, 14; James ii, 8.) The frequent enunciation of this law, both by Christ and by his apostles, indicates its importance. St. Paul explicitly asserted that importance when he declared: "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law." (Rom. xiii, 10.) The objects of this love are to be restricted by no boundaries narrower than those of the race. It must embrace all the children of our common Father, whether they are brethren in Christ or not. Its appointed measure is our own highest and truest self-love. It requires us to be as regardful of our neighbor's interests as of what belongs to ourselves. If we are to deny our own sinful appetences, we are to be equally careful not to excite or minister to his. If we are to watch and pray lest we enter into temptation, we are to be at the same pains not to lead him into it. In no way is this law oftener or more flagrantly violated than by setting our neighbor a bad example. And no example is more pernicious than that of the man who uses, however moderately, alcoholic beverages. On every hand we have the weak and the tempted as our neighbors, and, if it were supposable that we did not need to abstain on our own account, the obligation of abstinence for their sakes would still be imperative. The law of love covers this ground, as is plain from such passages as Rom. xv, 1: "We, then, that are strong (*οἱ δυνατοί*) ought to bear the infirmities (*τὰ ἀσθενήματα*, the weaknesses) of the weak, (*τῶν ἀδυνάτων*, the strengthless.)" Upon this divine law the whole doctrine of Christian expediency, so called, is grounded. St. Paul has expounded and enforced that doctrine with especial reference to meats offered to idols, (Rom. xiv; 1 Cor. vi, 12, 13; viii, 4–13; x, 19–33.) He has formulated it in these terms: "It is good (*καλόν*, morally excellent or befitting) neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine (*οἶνον*), nor (to do) any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth (*προσκόπτει*), or is offended (*σκανδαλίζεται*, is entrapped or tempted), or is made weak (*ἀσθενεῖ*, is weak.)" (Rom. xiv, 21.) It would seem hardly possible to make a stronger or more comprehensive announce-

ment of this principle. But Professor Bumstead protests against its indiscriminate application to the duty of total abstinence.* Two only of his statements call for consideration. (*a*) "The abstinence so repeatedly and forcibly inculcated is always for the sake of those who are ethically weak—weak in the possession of an overscrupulous conscience." That such is the immediate application of the principle may be true. But it cannot be confined to so narrow a range. It is ample enough to include within its scope every case and circumstance where the main point is involved—the temptation and sin of another. "The duty of abstinence," continues the Professor,† "for the sake of those who are physically weak, does not appear to have been in the apostle's mind." Possibly not, but the question is not what was in the apostle's mind, but what is in his principle. Does that apply to those physically weak? Professor Bumstead admits ‡ that such "may be fairly drawn from his words by analogy." But if so much, why not more? How about those who are volitionally weak, whose consciences are not "overscrupulous," but properly sensitive on this subject, and yet whose general moral power is enfeebled by indulgence? § Shall we be under no obligations to abstain for their sakes? Does the principle not hold good when temptation is strongest and stumbling most fatal. Is the commandment not broad enough to cover all cases where the soul's highest interests are at stake? (*b*) But Professor Bumstead complains ‖ that in our "constant and exclusive appeal to that portion of Paul's precepts, which inculcate benevolent abstinence," we ignore "the precepts declarative of Christian liberty." But we claim that in the use of alcoholic beverages Christian liberty is not involved. That finds play only within the sphere of things innocent or indifferent in themselves. Outside that limit it has no range, and if it pass beyond, it is straightway transformed into license. We think we have shown that the use of alcoholic beverages does not belong to the category of things innocent or indifferent.¶ To attempt the

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 97. † Ibid. ‡ Ibid.

§ Meyer accurately says (Comm. *in loc.*) that ἀσθενεῖ, *is weak*, in this passage (Rom. xiv, 21) "denotes one morally powerless to withstand temptation and to follow his moral conviction."

‖ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 115. ¶ *Supra* p. 2 f.

application of the doctrine of Christian liberty to them, is to make the very mistake which St. Paul corrects in the Corinthians. Because he had maintained the right of individual liberty regarding the eating of things offered to idols, he had been quoted as an authority for liberty regarding fornication.* So, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, he proceeds to show that this principle of Christian liberty "does not refer to matters which are absolutely wrong, and that even in its application to indifferent matters it must be limited and guarded by other Christian principles." † So that, even if we were to agree with Professor Bumstead and admit the use of alcoholic beverages to be an intrinsically innocent procedure, still the difficulty would remain. Christian liberty is conditioned by the proviso that it is not to be used "for an occasion to the flesh," and, by the general law, "by love serve one another." (Gal. v, 13.) Its sphere is bounded not simply by the limits of things lawful (ἔξεστι, it is permitted) for one's self, but by the narrower lines of things expedient (συμφέρει, it is profitable) for others. (1 Cor. vi, 12.) Within this inner circle the law of love bids every man take up his position. Nor does it permit him to go outside of this boundary. He may not *lawfully* do what is *inexpedient* to be done. For an act, however innocent in itself, if it be injurious in its influence upon others, is thereby rendered not simply inexpedient, but, by very reason of its inexpediency, unlawful. Personal liberty ceases to be liberty when it becomes an occasion of temptation to others. To attempt its exercise under such circumstances is to turn it into license. It is to sin against one's brother, and so to sin against Christ. Upon one thus guilty Christ pronounces his heaviest condemnation. "Woe unto the world because of offenses, (τῶν σκανδάλων, literally snares, *i.e.*, temptations, R. V. "occasions of stumbling,") for it must be that offenses (R. V. "the occasions") come," he says; "But woe to that man by whom the offense (R.V. "the occasion") cometh." (Matt. xviii, 7; Luke xvii, 1.) The two woes are to be distinguished. There is "woe to the world," because of the sources of temptation which are in it, and no woes greater than those which come from temptations to indulgence in alcoholic beverages. But

* *Vide* Meyer, "Commentary on 1 Corinthians" vi, 12. † Ellicott, Comm. *in loc.*

there is πλὴν οὐαί, woe besides, more woe, or woe beyond woe,* to him by whom the temptation comes. It is bad for men to yield to temptation; it is, if possible, infinitely worse for those who cause the temptation. Well does Dr. Abbott say:† "So great is the evil of becoming a cause of temptation to others or to yourself, that it is better to cut off the most innocent enjoyment, or even useful exercise of a God-given power, than so to use it as to lead yourself or others into sin." And if that be true, how unspeakably more important is it to cut off an enjoyment that is not innocent, to deny an appetite that is not God-given, and to abstain from a practice that is not useful, but which, beyond every other, is likely to lead one into sin, and to prove a source of incalculable evil to others.

If there be any other principle, applicable to this case, which we have not considered, it is summed up in

(4) The Law of Perfection, which Christ announced in his Sermon on the Mount. Its brief but pregnant form is, "Be ye perfect." (Matt. v, 48.) The command includes every duty which we owe to ourselves, to our neighbor, or to the cause of Christ in general. It covers every possible moral excellence; calls for a complete obedience to all the laws of right-doing and well-being; and aims at the development of a character which is at once comprehensive and symmetrical. If, therefore, the positions which we have taken throughout this inquiry be sustained, and the use of alcoholic beverages be not only needless but harmful in health, if they have a fatal facility for begetting an unnatural appetite that grows by gratification; if they tend to lead men into all vicious and sinful excesses, and if the evil of indulgence does not stop with the individual, but becomes a pervasive and pernicious influence in the community, causing the weak to stumble, and the brother for whom Christ died to perish, then this habit is inconsistent with the command of Christ, and, if we would be perfect, we must wholly abstain from all that can intoxicate.

But in this case we are not left solely to the guidance of general principles. The use of alcoholic beverages, with all their injurious consequences, was an evil so prevalent in his

* Such is the force of πλήν fr. πλέον, more, *vide* Liddell and Scott. "Lexicon," *s. v.*

† Comm. *in loc.*

own day, and destined to work such ravages in days to come, that Christ did not leave his condemnation of it without specific expression, nor its extirpation solely to the influence of his general spirit and instructions. Upon this subject he has left us several

(2) *Particular Precepts.* They are found not only in the Gospels which record his direct utterances, but in the Epistles which contain his revealed will. These were composed by men who had enjoyed unequaled advantages of personal intercourse with him, and who had had every opportunity of learning his sentiments and purposes. They were ordained to teach men all things whatsoever he had commanded them. (Matt. xxviii, 20.) That they might do this with fidelity and authority the Holy Spirit was given in his name to teach them all things and to bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he said unto them. (John xiv, 26.) Their writings, consequently, were "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii, 13.) We are justified in searching them, therefore, to discover the mind of Christ on any subject. His precepts upon the topic under consideration, when gathered from Gospels and Epistles, group themselves naturally under three heads.

(1) Prohibitions of drunkenness and of the use of wine. The only one directly from Christ's own lips is recorded by Luke (xxi, 34): "And take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged (*βαρυνθῶσιν*, literally, weighed down) with surfeiting (*κραιπάλῃ*) and drunkenness (*μέθῃ*) and the cares of life." Referring to this passage, Dr. Moore asks,* "If our Lord had intended that abstinence from common wine should be the law of his kingdom, could he have deemed it sufficient to admonish his disciples to guard against being overcome by debauch and drunkenness?" Before attempting to answer his question, let us notice that this is the construction put by Dr. Moore and his school on this whole class of passages, namely, Rom. xiii, 13; Eph. v, 18; 1 Tim. iii, 3, 8; Titus i, 7; ii, 3; 1 Peter iv, 3; also 1 Cor. v, 11; vi, 10, and Gal. v, 21. Professor Bumstead calls them† condemnations of the intemperate use of wine, and interprets them as

* "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 88.

† "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 87.

sanctions of its moderate use. He says,* "The Bible surely would not contain so many condemnations of the excessive use of wine if it did not mean, at the same time, to sanction its moderate use;" and so, in substance, says Dr. Moore.† But can such a position be sustained? Does Christ in his word simply prohibit such an intemperate indulgence in alcoholic beverages as amounts to open drunkenness, and does he thereby put his sanction upon its use to any extent short of actual intoxication? The claim that he does seems to us to be made in

a. Utter bondage to the letter of the law. It is a species of legalistic interpretation savoring of Judaism, and altogether foreign to the spirit of Christianity. It is precisely after the pattern of them of old time who imagined that the commandment "Thou shalt love thy neighbor" gave permission to "hate thine enemy." But when Christ came he overturned this whole system of exegesis. He taught men that "love thy neighbor" means "love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you." (Matt. v, 44.) He taught them that the command, "Thou shall not kill," instead of sanctioning any violence short of down-right murder, forbids even hatred in the heart toward another; and that the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," instead of permitting indulgence to passion provided it stop short of the overt act, does not allow so much as the lustful look. By the prohibition of any practice Christ places his interdict on every thing that leads to it or partakes of its spirit. By condemning a class of sins in their most aggravated form he condemns them in all their degrees and disguises. And so, in denouncing drunkenness, he forbids all wine-bibbing and moderate drinking, which are approaches to it and stages of it.

b. The physical basis upon which these authors attempt to rest their inference in favor of moderate drinking is a false one. It does not exist. This is the way in which Dr. Moore puts it:‡ "The effect produced by a little genuine wine is *not* intoxication, but exhilaration. Psa. civ, 15. These two conditions are essentially different and not varied in degree; though

* "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 88.

† "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 92.

‡ Ibid., p. 93.

which of them shall be produced depends on the quantity of wine drunk." The quotation from the Psalms, when correctly interpreted, lends no countenance to such a theory. The attempted distinction between intoxication and exhilaration has no foundation in fact. The two conditions are not essentially different. They do vary simply in degree. Intoxication is both etymologically and scientifically poisoning.* Says Dr. Carpenter:† "The condition of drunkenness in all its stages is one of poisoning." Exhilaration is an incipient stage of poisoning. "Poison is the name of an intrinsic *quality*, and has no reference whatever to *quantity*, quantity being only considered in regard to the *extent* of its *poisonous effects*. One particle of opium, or one drop of alcohol, therefore, is as much and truly a *poison* as a pound or a gallon." ‡ No one doubts that alcohol, when taken in any considerable quantity, is "a true narcotic poison." § It produces paralysis—a suspension of the functional activity of the nervous system. Its symptoms are plain and unmistakable, such as the flushed face, perspiring skin, accelerated pulse, etc. It is equally unquestionable that alcohol in any dose, however small, is always an active poison to some persons. But it is also a matter of evidence that alcohol, even in the most moderate quantities, produces genuine narcotism in all cases. Though the ordinary signs may not appear, and the common and coarser tests fail to detect it, yet it reveals itself to a sharper and more subtle scrutiny. The maximum amount of alcohol which can be taken "without any *perceptible* injurious effect" is, according to Dr. Anstie, one and one half ounce; ‖ according to Dr. Parkes, one ounce; ¶ according to Dr. Ganod, nine tenths of an ounce.** But by the use of the delicate instruments with which modern science is equipped, the narcotic effect of doses of alcohol much smaller than these maximum amounts is distinctly observed. The thermometer, for instance, in the hands of such experts as Bouvier, Daub,

* Youmans on Alcohol, pp. 71 and 92. Richardson, "The Effects of Alcohol," pp. 1, 2.

† "Alcoholic Liquors," American edition, p. 30.

‡ J. M. M'Culloch, M.D., in "The Alliance Weekly News," March 14, 1857.

§ *Vide* Anstie in Reynolds' "System of Medicine," American edition, i, 671.

‖ "The Practitioner," xiii, 28.

¶ "Manual of Practical Hygiene," p. 277.

** "Popular Science Monthly (New Issue) Supplement," Feb., 1879, p. 54.

and Riegel,* discloses diminished temperatures as the result of taking very small doses of alcohol. Dr. Mulvaney, staff surgeon of the British navy, applying the galvanometer to this problem, found that an ounce of brandy, equal to about half an ounce of alcohol, violently excited the thermo-electric currents of the system, the instrument being raised, in one instance, twenty-five, and in another forty-five degrees.† Drs. Nicol and Mossop, of Edinburgh, in a course of experiments made upon each other, ascertained by means of the ophthalmoscope that less than a quarter of an ounce of alcohol paralyzed the nerves controlling the delicate blood vessels of the retina, and congested the vessels themselves.‡ Similar evidence of the disturbing effect of very small quantities of alcohol on the circulatory system is afforded by the sphygmograph.§ The tendency of all such investigations, which are being carried to further and finer limits as science multiplies and perfects her instruments, is to make it certain that the intoxicating effects of moderate or minute doses of alcohol, though less extended and unaccompanied by the ordinary and more palpable symptoms of narcosis, are yet just as real as when large quantities of strong alcohol are consumed, and deep coma and unconsciousness supervene.

c. The absurdity of the interpretation which wrests from these passages a sanction for moderate drinking is exposed by the application of a similar method to other portions of Scripture. It would be just as reasonable to construe the injunction, "Be not overmuch wicked," literally, "Do not multiply wickednesses," (Eccles. vii, 17,) as a warrant for modified wickedness; or the command, "Lay apart . . . all superfluity of naughtiness," (James i, 21,)—for the parallel is not affected by calling it a Hebraism for evil excesses—as a sanction of all evil not excessive; or the statement that unbelievers thought it strange that Christians "run not with them to the same excess of riot," (1 Pet. iv, 4,) literally, "outpouring of profligacy," as permission to indulge in minor irregularities. It would be quite in keeping with this style of interpretation to understand Luke xxi, 34 as allowing any degree of drunkenness which did not

* Ziemssen, "Cyclopedia of the Practice of Medicine," xvii, 387.

† London "Lancet," 1875, vol. ii, 166.

‡ "British and Foreign Medico-Chirurgical Review," i, 200 f.

§ Lyman, "Artificial Anæsthesia and Anæsthetics," p. 246.

incapacitate or weigh down a man;* or Eph. v, 18 as tolerating intoxication provided it were not excessive, or was caused by some other beverage than wine, (*οἶνος*,) as, for instance, by beer, (*ζύθος*.) In immediate connection with one of these expressions most commonly quoted in defense of moderate drinking, namely, "not given to much wine," (1 Tim. iii, 8,) we find this added qualification of deacons "not greedy of filthy lucre," *μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς*, literally, "not sordidly greedy of gain,"† and equivalent to the Latin *turpilucri cupidus*, (Plautus,) "covetous of base or dishonest gains."‡ Now, shall we regard the apostle as justifying, by the use of this term, cupidity or trade craftiness in any degree? And yet it would be just as legitimate as the inference to which we object.

d. And just here we wish to emphasize the fact that this whole claim that the Bible sanctions the moderate use of alcoholic beverages is *only* an inference. It is unsupported by a single positive statement or direct inculcation. There is not one instance in either the Old or the New Testaments where the condemnation of excess is joined with any approval of moderation. This is particularly significant in view of the number of such passages, and in contrast with prevalent usages in the ethical and religious writings of ancient and, we may add, of modern times. For they take constant occasion to set off and recommend moderation as the proper opposite to excess in the use of strong drink. The Scriptures, however, do nothing of the sort. The only alternative which they expressly mention and enjoin is abstinence. Nowhere is moderation in the use of wine alluded to or allowed. The only exception which could possibly be noted is Paul's advice to Timothy, (1 Tim. v, 23:) "Be no longer a water-drinker, (*ὑδροπότει*, the term popularly applied to one who abstained from intoxicating drinks,) but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine often infirmities." But this is, after all, not an exception, since the advice is purely personal and exclusively medicinal. There is no intimation of

* The objection of Prof. Bumstead ("Bibliotheca Sacra," p. 89) to this *reductio ad absurdum* is not well taken. The literal sense of the verb, which is a very strong one, does not preclude this distinction between excessive and moderate drunkenness. And we think him in error in saying the verb has an unemphatic position.

† Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," who cite the Latin synonym.

‡ Harper's "Latin Dictionary," 1880, *s. v.*

the kind of wine prescribed, and permission is given, not to drink it, but to use (*χρῶ*) it as one would any drug.* The natural and legitimate inference, therefore, from this class of texts is not that the Bible sanctions the moderate use of alcoholic liquors, but that it condemns all indulgence in such beverages.

There are some further considerations attaching to these passages which help us to a clear and correct understanding of them, and which deserve to be carefully noted:

i. The terms rendered "drunkenness," "drunk," and "drunkard," do not always and necessarily denote the state of intoxication. *Μέθη*, (Luke xxi, 34; Rom. xiii, 12; Gal. v, 21,) translated (A. V.) "drunkenness," has primarily the signification of copious indulgence in drinks, whether intoxicating or otherwise. It is distinguished from *κραιπάλη*, (Luke xxi, 34,) literally, "seizure of the head," and vividly descriptive of intoxication;† and from *κῶμοι*, (Rom. xiii, 13; Gal. v, 21,) revelings, the disorderly conduct characteristic of intoxication.‡ "Intoxication is not the essence, but only the extreme of the vice" indicated by the term. "The essential of the vice is that men drink for pleasure regardless of the laws of God or the claims of man." § *Μεθύσκεσθε*, (Eph. v, 18,) rendered (A. V.) "be drunk," has already been examined, and shown to signify drinking to repletion without regard to the nature of the liquor used. *Μέθυσος*, (1 Cor. v, 11; vi, 10,) rendered (A. V.) "drunkard," shares the general signification of the root, and means literally "one who fills himself with drink," not excluding drinks of an unintoxicating sort. It is a fair inference, therefore, that these passages do not prohibit the intemperate use of *alcoholic* beverages simply. This is further sustained by the fact that

ii. The term rendered "wine" (A. V.) in Eph. v, 18; 1 Tim. iii, 3, 8; Titus i, 7; ii, 3; 1 Pet. iv, 3, is the generic *οἶνος*. It

* Dr. Kerr says ("Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 22) that he prescribes non-alcoholic wine "in the treatment of . . . that most depressing malady, dyspepsia, from one of the Protean forms of which Timothy may have suffered when he received the prescription of probably a like wine from the Apostle Paul."

† The etymology of *κραιπάλη* is obscure, but its most probable derivation is from *κάρα*, head, and the root of *ἁρπάζω*, to seize; cf. Latin, *carpo*, *rapio*. (Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.*) Clement (Paed., ii) derives it from *κάρα*, head, and *πάλλω*, to shake. Similar is Suidas' definition of the word as *ὁ ἐκ πολλῆς οἰνώσεως πάλμος*, shaking from over-indulgence in wine.

‡ *Vide* Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.* § "Temperance Bible Comm.," p. 349.

is probable that its excessive use is forbidden on the same grounds as gluttony, without reference to the character of the liquor. We know that the Scriptures bring immoderate eating and drinking under the same condemnation, (*e. g.*, Deut. xxi, 20; Prov. xxiii, 21; Matt. xi, 19, etc.,) without thereby implying any judgment as to the fitness or otherwise of the food or drink. Neither these passages nor those under immediate consideration have any necessary bearing on the question of using intoxicating beverages, which is wrong irrespective of any considerations of quantity. Chancellor Crosby, referring to 1 Tim. iii, 8, asks:* "Did Paul mean the fermented wine? Then he allowed the deacons to use it as a beverage. Did he mean unfermented wine? Then why did he limit the amount?" We have shown that the assumption in this quotation is unfounded. We hope soon to make that still more apparent. Its last interrogation is answered by the fact that fermented wine was not the only drink intemperately consumed in ancient times. Innocent beverages were abused. Cratinus, in his "Ulysses," as quoted by Athenæus, (Banq., iii, 56,) says:

"You were all day glutting yourselves with white milk."

Solomon specifically condemns intemperate indulgence in one form of unfermented grape-juice: "It is not good to eat (*akol*) much *debash*." (Prov. xxv, 27.) Unfermented wine, the simple γλεῦκος, was often drank to excess. W. H. Rule, in his "Brief Inquiry," admits that "The Roman ladies were so fond of it that they would first fill their stomachs with it, then throw it off by emetics, and repeat the draught. Wetstein in Acts ii, 13."† Lucian refers to the same practice when he uses the following illustration, (Philops., 39:) ἦκω νὴ τὸν Δία, ὥσπερ οἱ τοῦ γλεύκους πιόντες, ἐμπεφυσημένος τὴν γαστέρα, ἐμέτου δεόμενος, "I am come, by Jove, as those having drank gleukos, swelling out their belly, require an emetic."

iii. Further light is thrown upon the proper interpretation of these passages by some of their contexts.

a. In 1 Tim. iii, 3, and Titus i, 7, Paul says a bishop (A. V.) "must be . . . not given to wine," μὴ πάροινον. Professor Bumstead comments on this,‡ "it is also indisputable that it is

* "A Calm View," etc. † Quoted in "Temperance Bible Comm.," p. 378.
‡ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 88.

excess"—in using intoxicating wine, of course—"which is forbidden," and proceeds to quote the renderings of Robinson, Ellicott, and others to that effect. Dr. Moore says:* "Μὴ πάροινος must mean either 'not drunken,' or, according to the marginal rendering of the English Bible, 'not ready to quarrel and offer wrong as one in wine,'" and cites Passow, "the highest authority in Greek lexicography," in evidence. But here, as elsewhere in the Scriptures, the lexicon is not the safest guide. It "can only furnish the general signification, whereas the interpreter wants the precise sense with its exact shade, as determined by the particular position in which it stands."† In this instance we find πάροινον in 1 Tim. iii, 3 placed in antithesis to νηφάλεον, ver. 2, and in Titus i, 7 to ἐγκρατῆ, ver. 8; and it must be explained by these terms in this connection. But νηφάλεον and ἐγκρατῆ, as will soon appear, signify abstinence from intoxicating beverages, and μὴ πάροινον cannot, therefore, mean merely freedom from their excessive use. It probably carries its literal signification, "not near wine," and forbids the presence of a bishop at drinking parties. In this sense it escapes all appearance of tautology, and forms a natural climax to the other terms.

b. Again, Paul says (Titus ii, 3) that the aged women should be "not given to much wine," μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας. "We can explain why *aged* women are singled out, as if peculiarly liable to be addicted to excess of wine," says Dr. Moore,‡ "by the fact that physicians, both ancient and modern, have recommended to those advanced in years the use of wine, which they would withhold from the young." The latter statement we are not disposed to question, nor the fact that aged women (as Paul would seem to indicate by his strong expression "enslaved") were especially addicted to excess of wine.§ But this is really a reason why abstinence rather than moderation should have been recommended. The doctor is scarcely correct in saying "*aged* women are singled out." In 1 Tim.

* "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 92.

† Davidson, "Text of the Old Testament," p. 211.

‡ "Presbyterian Review," Jan., 1881, p. 92.

§ The ancient scholiast on Homer, "Iliad," vi, according to Dr. Adam Clarke, (Comm. *in loc.*,) speaking of old women, says Χαίρει τῷ οἴνῳ ἡ ἡλικία αὐτή. "This age delights in wine." Ovid seems to have translated these words literally, (Fasti iii, 765,) *vinosior aetas haec erat.*

iii, 11, Paul says the *γυναῖκας*, "women in general," must be *νηφάλεους*, *abstinent*. Nor does he single out aged *women*. In the verse just preceding he directs "that the aged men be sober," *νηφάλεους*, literally, abstinent. It is a matter of record that a much stricter abstinence was enjoined upon the women than upon the men in ancient times.* The apostle says that this injunction to "be not given to much wine" was laid upon the aged women in order that (*ἵνα*) they might (A.V.) "teach the young women to be sober, (*σωφρονίζωσι*,) ... discreet, (*σώφρονας*,) chaste, (*ἁγνάς*,)" etc. Titus ii, 4, 5. But the most successful teaching is by the force of example, and any thing less than abstinence would have disqualified one for the work of instructing young women, of whom abstinence and chastity were strictly required.† Well does St. Jerome ask, "*Quomodo potest docere anus adolescentulas castitatem, cum si ebrietatem vetulae mulieris adolescentula fuerit imitata, pudica esse non potest?*" ‡ "How can an elderly woman teach young women chastity when, if the young woman shall imitate inebriety in the matron, she can not be virtuous?"

c. Finally, let it be observed that Paul, after writing to Titus that bishops must be *μὴ πάροινος*, (i, 7,) and that the aged women must be *μὴ οἴνῳ πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας*, (ii, 3,) gives the reason for this and other requirements, (ii, 11, 12:) (R. V.) "For the grace of God hath appeared, bringing salvation to all men, instructing us, to the intent that, (*ἵνα*,) denying (*ἀρνησάμενοι*, literally, saying No! to, utterly refusing, abstaining from)§ ungodliness and worldly lusts, (*τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας*, and certainly including *ἐπιθυμία οἴνου*, the lust for wine,) we should live soberly, (*σωφρόνως*,) and righteously, and godly in this present world." This explanation, we think, clinches the apostle's argument here, and inferentially elsewhere, for universal total abstinence.

iv. One of the passages we have been considering calls for a separate examination, namely, Eph. v, 18. It is most

* *Vide* Polybius, "Hist. Kath.," i and vi, and Athenæus, "Banquet," x. 56.

† Wiesinger (in "Olshausen's Commentary," *in loc.*) says that this instruction was "not by public addresses. (1 Tim. ii, 12; 1 Cor. xiv, 34,) but by private admonition and *the example of their conduct*, in order that through them the young women might be directed to what is good."

‡ Quoted by A. Clarke, Comm. *in loc.*

§ Cf. Heb. xi, 24, and Matt. xvi, 24, and Matt. xxvi, 34, and the discussion of this verb *supra*, p. 99.

strenuously urged as a sanction of moderate drinking,* and it is especially represented as expressing the mind of Christ. "Wherefore be ye not unwise, (*ἄφρονες*, senseless, the contrast of *σώφρονες*, sober,) *but understanding what the will of the Lord is*," (Eph. v, 17,) says the apostle. "And be not drunk with wine wherein is excess; but be filled with the Spirit," (v, 18.) This is a direct and positive prohibition of something. But of what? Not of drunkenness specifically and exclusively, though the precept is broad enough to cover that. The verb *μεθύσκεσθε* is clearly used in its primitive signification of "drink copiously," or "to repletion." This is indicated by the annominatio† between *μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ*, "drunk with wine," and *πληροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι*, "filled with the Spirit." The contrast is not between moderation and excess, but between fullness of wine and fullness of the Spirit. Commentators‡ have illustrated the passage by Luke i, 15, where the promise that John should be "filled with the Holy Spirit," is joined with the divine prohibition, "wine and strong drink he shall not drink." The two passages plainly indicate the inherent incompatibility between indulgence in ardent spirits and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

But of what is the "excess" in this passage predicated? Of the drinking, Professor Bumstead§ and many others answer. "To connect it with wine," says the Professor, "is inconsistent with the employment of so strong a term as *μεθύσκεσθε*." We should say, rather, to connect it with "Be not drunk" is inconsistent with the employment of such a term as *ἀσωτία*, in the sense which Professor Bumstead, following the A. V., assigns to it, for that is to reduce the whole proposition to the empty platitude, excess = excess. But this is not an adequate rendering of the Greek term. It occurs in two other places

* Bumstead, ("Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 89,) Alford, Meyer, Lange, *et al.*

† Winer, "Grammar of the New Testament," Thayer, p. 638.

‡ Grotius, Harless, Olshausen, *et al.* Olshausen, *e.g.*, says, (Comm. *in loc.*,) "Man feels the want of a strengthening through spiritual influences from without; instead of seeking for these in the Holy Spirit he in his blindness has recourse to the 'natural' spirit, that is, to wine and strong drinks. Therefore, according to the point of view of the law, the Old Testament recommends abstinence from wine and strong drinks, in order to preserve the soul free from all merely natural influences, and by that means to make it more susceptible of the operations of the Holy Spirit."

§ "Bibliotheca Sacra," Jan., 1881, p. 88.

in the New Testament, namely, in Titus i, 6, and 1 Peter iv, 4, and in both instances it is rendered (A. V. and R. V.) "riot," as it now is, in the passage under discussion, by the R. V. In Luke xv, 13, the adverbial form ἀσώτως occurs, and is rendered in connection with the participle ζῶν (A.V. and R.V.) "riotous living." The word is compounded of *a* privative, and σώζειν, to save, and has a twofold signification, active and passive, in classic Greek. It denotes both inability to save, *i.e.*, prodigality, (cf. Aristotle, Eth. Nic., iv, 1, 3,) and the condition of insalvableness, that which cannot be saved.* In this latter or passive sense it seems to be used in Eph. v, 18. Clement says that by this term the apostle intimates "the inconsistency of drunkenness with salvation." † Theophylact, in his comments on the passage, defines its victim as one "who does not save but destroys both soul and body." Grotius says in this instance it applies to those who are "so immersed in vices that their salvation is despaired of." Bloomfield says that "it represents the state of a person whom (to use the classical saying) 'even the goddess of salvation herself could not save.'" ‡ When correctly interpreted there is no objection to connecting ἀσωτία with μεθύσκεσθε. It is both grammatically and logically possible. Drunkenness in all its stages is a state of insalvableness. It is a condition in which one not only *is* not, but *can* not be saved. We believe, however, that this passage predicates ἀσωτία of οἶνος. We understand very well that this is not the interpretation of the majority of modern expositors. They refer the relative ᾧ to the whole of the preceding phrase, μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ, as its antecedent. But their construction of the passage is expressly founded on the assumption that the use of wine is elsewhere allowed in the New Testament, and not on any exegetical necessities in the text itself. § On the contrary, the position of οἴνῳ following the verb and in immediate juxtaposition with the relative, though not absolutely determinative, is strongly corroborative of our interpretation.‖ That was

* *Vide* Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *s. v.*, and Trench, "Synonyms of the New Testament," i, § xvi.

† Paed., ii, 2.

‡ "Notes on the New Testament," *in loc.*

§ *Vide, e. g.*, Meyer, Comm. *in loc.*

‖ *Vide* Short, "On the Order of Words in the Attic Greek Prose," § xxv, in Yonge's "English Greek Lexicon," Harper & Bros.

certainly the understanding of our English translators, and it is not negatived by any thing that appears in the R. V. It is the explanation likewise of such eminent authorities as Schœttgen,* Bengel,† and Doddridge,‡ the former of whom justifies his exegesis by references to rabbinical literature.§ It would be difficult to indicate any other arrangement of the words of this passage which would so clearly and forcibly express the idea that insalvableness *inheres* in wine as its essential characteristic. And, for our part, we cannot doubt that by this phraseology the Omniscient Spirit, speaking through the apostle, designed to describe that principle in wine which we call "alcohol," and which, when used as a beverage,

> "With slow perdition murders the whole man,
> Body and soul."

In the light, therefore, which modern science has thrown upon the exegesis of this verse, we think ourselves fairly warranted in regarding it as a prohibition of "any wine wherein is alcohol." And as all Scripture, rightly interpreted, is consistent with itself, the other passages we have considered must be in harmony in this, and all be accepted as total abstinence precepts.

(2) Injunctions to sobriety occur frequently in the Epistles of Peter and of Paul. Each employs two different terms to express this quality, both of which are rendered (A.V. and R.V.) "sober." They are not synonymous, but in strict usage denote, the one mental sobriety, and the other physical sobriety or abstinence. The two, however, are very closely correlated in their meanings, which are very often merged or interchanged. This is explained by the fact that each term regards the same virtue, but from two different standpoints. Physical abstinence is the condition of the clearest mental sobriety, and mental sobriety is the characteristic of the strictest physical abstinence. So it happens that the term signifying mental sobriety is used metaphorically for physical abstinence, and *vice versa.* This explanation will serve to clear away the confusion which sometimes clings to their interpretation. We shall consider them separately.

* "Horæ Hebraicæ," p. 780.

† "Gnomon of the New Testament," *in loc.* ‡ "Family Expositor," *in loc.*

§ *E. g.*, *Ubicunque est vinum ibi est immunditia*, Wherever there is wine there is impurity. (Bammidb-rabba, sec. 10, fol., 206, 3.)

i. Mental sobriety is denoted by *σώφρων*, rendered (A. V.) "sober," (1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 8;) "temperate" (Titus ii, 2) and "discreet," (Titus ii, 5;) in each instance rendered "sober-minded" by the R.V.; *σωφροσύνη*, (A.V. and R.V.,) "soberness," (Acts xxvi, 25; 1 Tim. ii, 9, 15;) *σωφρονέω*, (A. V. and R. V.,) "in his right mind," (Mark v, 15; Luke viii, 35;) "to think soberly," (Rom. xii, 3;) "be sober," (2 Cor. v, 13, R. V., "are of sober mind;" 1 Peter iv, 7, R. V., "of sound mind,") and "be sober-minded," (Titus ii, 6;) *σωφρονίζω*, to "teach one to be sober," (Titus ii, 4, R.V., "to train" simply;) and *σωφρόνως*, (A. V. and R. V.,) "soberly," (Titus ii, 12.) The word is compounded of *σαός*, *σῶς*, Lat. *salvus et integer*, "safe and sound," and *φρήν*, Lat. *mens*, mind. It signifies literally "sound-minded," Lat. *sanae mentis*. Liddell and Scott render* "discreet, prudent, etc., especially, free from sensual desires, temperate, chaste, sober." Donnegan,† "sound in intellect, not deranged." Green,‡ "of a sound mind, sane, staid, temperate, chaste." Ellicott defines *σωφροσύνη* § as "the well-balanced state of mind arising from habitual self-restraint." Trench explains it ‖ as "an habitual inner self-government, with its constant rein on all the passions and desires." While every-where retaining the primary idea of mental soundness, this term never loses sight of the bodily abstinence or continence in which the mental quality has its physical basis. This appears in the use and interpretation of the word by the ancient philosophers. Plato (Symp. 196 c.,) says, *εἶναι γὰρ ὁμολογεῖται σωφροσύνη τὸ κρατεῖν ἡδονῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμιῶν*, "For sobriety is the acknowledged ruler of the pleasures and desires." He uses almost the same language in "Gorgias" (491 D.) and "De Republica," (iv, 449,) and in the Charmides he has dedicated a whole dialogue to the investigation of this word, with very similar results. Aristotle defines *σωφροσύνη* (Rhet. i, 9) as *ἀρετὴ δι' ἣν τρὸς τάς ἡδονὰς τοῦ σώματος οὕτως ἔχουσιν ὡσ ὁ νόμος κελεύει*, "The virtue by which men act with reference to the pleasures of the body as the law commands." In his Ethics he speaks more specifically. He says, (Eth. Nic. ii, 9,) *ἔκ τε γὰρ τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἡδονῶν, γινόμεθα σώφρονες*, "By *abstaining* from

* "Lexicon," *s. v.* † "Lexicon," *s. v.* ‡ "Lexicon," *s. v.*
§ Comm. on 1 Tim. ii, 9.
‖ "Synonyms of the New Testament," i, § xx.

pleasures we become sober." And again, (Eth. Nic. ii, 3, 1,) *ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεχόμενος τῶν σωματικῶν ἡδονῶν, καί αὐτῷ τούτῳ χαίρων, σώφρων*, "He who *abstains* from physical pleasures, and in this very thing takes delight, is sober." In the patristic writings, as in the classic authors, this term is employed with reference to physical abstinence. That is the thought in Clement's mind when he writes, (Paed. ii,) "I therefore admire those who have adopted an austere life and who are fond of water, the medicine of temperance, (*τῆς σωφροσύνης,*) *and flee as far as possible from wine, shunning it as they would the danger of fire.*" We find Origen, too, using the word in this same sense, (A. in Matt. Ed. Huet., tom. 1, p. 363,) *γυμναζόμενος εἰς ἁγνείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην*, "exercising one's self to chastity and abstinence." And so in the Apostolic Epistles, especially in such cases as 1 Tim. iii, 2; Titus i, 8; ii, 2, and 1 Peter iv, 7, there can be no doubt that sober-mindedness is enjoined with explicit reference to the physical abstinence on which its existence and exercise are conditioned. This is evidenced, if in no other way, by the close connection in which it stands with such terms as *μὴ πάροινος*, *ἐγκρατή* and *νηφάλεος*, already considered.

ii. Physical abstinence is denoted by *νηφάλεον*, which is a late form for *νηφάλιος*. It is rendered (A. V.) "sober," (1 Tim. iii, 11; Titus ii, 2, R. V., "temperate,") and "vigilant," (1 Tim. iii, 2, R. V., "temperate.") The verbal form, *νήφω*, occurs several times, and is rendered (A. V. and R. V.) "be sober," (1 Thess. v, 6, 8; 1 Peter i, 13; v, 8; 2 Tim. iv, 5, A. V., "watch;" 1 Peter iv, 7, A. V., "watch.) The compound form *ἐκνήφω* occurs (1 Cor. xv, 34,) rendered (A.V.) "awake," (R.V.) "awake up," and *ἀνανήφω*, (2 Tim. ii, 26,) rendered (A. V. and R. V.) "recover themselves." *Νήφω* is probably compounded of the inseparable privative prefix *νη* and *πίνω* (stems *πι* and *πο*) to drink, and so signifies, literally, not to drink, or to abstain from drink.* There is a noteworthy unanimity among all the authorities as to its signification. Thomas Magister defines *Νήφει τις ὅταν ἐκτὸς μέθης ἐστιν*, "One is

* So Schleusner (Lexicon, *s. v.*) followed by other lexicographers, as Pickering. Chassang (Lexicon, *s. v.*), derives it from *νη* and *Γοῖνος* for *οἶνος*. Other etymologies have been suggested, but none so probable as these. Many among the ancients, as Suidas, and, among modern authorities, as Liddell and Scott, give no derivation.

νηφάλιος when he is free from drink." Schleusner,* "*Sobrius sum, abstineo ab omni aut immoderato vini et omnis potus inebriantis usu*," I am sober; I abstain from all, or from the immoderate use of wine and all intoxicating drink. Bretschneider,† "*Sobrius sum, vino abstineo*," I am sober; I abstain from wine. Chassang,‡ "*N'avoir pas bu de vin, être sobre*," Not to have drank of wine, to be sober. Vanicek,§ "*Nicht trunken, d. h. nüchtern sein*," Not drunk, that is, to be sober. Liddell and Scott, ‖ "To be sober, live soberly, especially to drink no wine." Donnegan,¶ "To live abstemiously, to abstain from wine." Greene,** "To be sober, not intoxicated." Robinson,†† "To be sober, temperate, abstinent, especially in respect to wine." The adjective *νηφάλεος* or *νηφάλιος* is explained by these authorities in harmony with their rendering of the verb. Among others, and in addition to the above, it is defined by Hesychius,‡‡ *μὴ πεποικώς*, not having drank. Stephanus,§§ *ὁ ἀπέχων οἴνου*, he who abstains from wine. Byzantius, ‖‖ *ὁ μὴ πίνων οἶνον*, one who does not drink wine. Both by the classical and the Hellenistic writers, these words are used in their literal sense. Æschylus (Eumen. 107) mentions *χοὰς τ' ἀοίνους νηφάλια μειλίγματα*, "Wineless oblations, abstemious propitiations." So Sophocles (Œdip. Col. 101) describes Œdipus as saying to the Eumenides that he had come to them *νήφων ἀοίνους*, "I untasting wine to you who loathe the wine cup." ¶¶ And since their sacrifices must be *νηφάλιοι*, the chorus tells him (l. 481) the oblations should be

Ὕδατος μελίσσης· μηδὲ προσφέρειν μέθυ,

"Of water, of honey, and by no means offer intoxicating drink." According to Plutarch,*** the sacrifices offered to the Muses and the Nymphs were composed of water, milk, and honey, and called *νηφάλια*, in distinction from others which were accompanied with wine. And Athenæus informs us that "those who sacrifice to the sun make their libations of honey, as they never bring wine to the altars of the gods." ††† The altars on

* "Lexicon," *s. v.* † "Lexicon," *s. v.* ‡ "Lexicon," *s. v.*
§ "Etymologisches Wörterbuch," *s. v.* ‖ "Lexicon," *s. v.*
¶ "Lexicon," *s. v.* ** "Lexicon," *s. v.*
†† "Lexicon of the New Testament," *s. v.* ‡‡ "Lexicon," *s. v.*
§§ "Thesaurus," *s. v.* ‖‖ "Greek Dictionary," Athens, 1839, *s. v.*
¶¶ E. H. Plumptre's translation. *** Cf. Wyttenbach, Plut. 2, 132 E.
††† "Banquet," xv, 48.

which such offerings were made were called *νηφάλιοι βωμοί*, and the wood employed in the service was known as *ξύλα νηφάλια.** Herodotus (Hist., i, 133) says, "The Persians review when they are not drinking (*νήφουσι*) what they have decided when in liquor; and so what they have decided when not drinking (*νήφοντες*) they review when in liquor." Theognis in his "Maxims" (478) writes, *οὔτε τι νήφων εἶμ' οὔτε λίην μεθύων*, "I will go out neither sober, nor very drunk." Plato ("Phileb.," 61, c.) describes "a sober draught in which no wine mingles," (*νηφοντικὴν καὶ ἀοίνον.*) Porphyry, in like manner, ("De Abst.," i, 27,) speaks of *νηφάλιον καὶ ἀοίνον τὸ ποτόν*, "a drink abstemious and wineless." Numerous other instances of the use of *νήφω* and its derivatives in the sense of abstaining from wine occur in the classics.† But of especial importance to our inquiry is the usage of the Hellenistic writers. In the LXX only the compound verb *ἐκνήφω* and the verbal noun *ἔκνηψις* are found. In Gen. ix, 24, and 1 Sam. xxv, 37, the verb is followed by *ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου*, and in Joel i, 5, by *ἐξ οἴνου*, and signifies to become sober, literally, abstinent from wine. In Hab. ii, 7, 19, it is used alone and in a metaphorical sense, signifying to awake. Josephus and Philo were the contemporaries of Peter and Paul. The former says, ("Antiq.," iii, 12, 2,) "The priests are in all respects pure and abstinent, (*νηφάλιοι,*) not being allowed to drink wine as they wear the priestly garment." And again, ("Bel. Jud.," v, 5, 7,) "They (the priests) especially abstained from unmixed wine, (*ἀπὸ ἀκράτου νήφοντες.*)" He also ("Bel. Jud.," ii, 8) applies the term *νήψις* to the abstinence of the Essenes. And Philo writes, ("On Drunkenness," 32,) "The truly wise man aims to offer abstemious sacrifices, (*νηφάλια θύειν,*) steadfastly setting himself, in the strength of his purpose, against wine and every cause of folly." In Section 37 of the same treatise he employs *νήφειν* in the sense of to abstain, and *νήψις* with the signification of sobriety. The natural and necessary inference from this mass of evidence is that in the writings of the apostles these terms are employed with specific reference to their primary sense. They must be held to constitute, wherever

* *Vide* Liddell and Scott, "Lexicon," *sub νηφάλιος.*

† *E. g.*, in Apollo Hymn xi, 525, 14; Archilochus, (5, Bergk.;) Aristophanes, ("Lysist.," 1228;) Plato, ("Laws," vi, 733; "Epist.," vii, 330.)

found in the New Testament, total abstinence precepts and maxims. And if in any instance they should be used somewhat metaphorically, to call attention to that self-possession and energy of mind which characterize the abstainer, it is only to give the more emphatic sanction to his course. In no case is the underlying idea of total abstinence lost sight of. When Paul says, (1 Thess. v, 6,) "Let us watch and be sober," (*γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν,*) and Peter (1 Pet. v, 8) says, "Be sober, be vigilant," (*νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε,*) there can be no question that the primitive signification is the one intended. In each case *γρηγορέω* denotes the mental state, and *νήφω* its physical condition. Both represent total abstinence as the price of vigilance. The second passage presents a remarkable confirmation of our interpretation. Dr. Adam Clarke was perhaps the first to call attention to "the striking apposition between the first and the last words."* "Drink not, (*νήψατε,*) be vigilant, because your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about seeking whom he may drink down, (*καταπίῃ.*)" Upon which Dr. Clarke aptly comments, "If you swallow strong drink down, the devil will swallow you down." There can be no question, we think, that in 1 Tim. iii, 2, 11, and in Titus ii, 2, *νηφάλιος* is used in its literal sense of abstinent. This is the judgment of Wiesinger† and of other eminent expositors. A careful collation of the passages in which *σωφρονέω* and *νήφω* with their derivatives occur, and a comparison of their usage in classic and Hellenistic Greek, convince us that they directly inculcate and insist upon the universal duty of total abstinence from all intoxicating beverages.

(3.) Inculcations of Temperance. Before entering on their special examination it is necessary to notice a charge of Chancellor Crosby‡ that "the word (temperance) has been violently wrested from its legitimate meaning" and made to signify "total abstinence from all that can intoxicate." He calls this a "fearful prostitution of a noble word," and attempts to show "that the Latin *temperantia* signifies the moral quality of moderation or discreetness, and that the English word 'temperance,' as used in all good standard English works, means precisely the same thing." Waiving, for a moment, the

* "Comm.." *in loc.*

† Olshausen's "Comm." *in* Tim. iii, 2.

‡ "A Calm View," etc.

consideration that it is not what the Latin *temperantia* or the English "temperance" means, but what the underlying Greek word signifies, that must determine our conception of the New Testament virtue, we will glance at the chancellor's assertions. And, in the first place, we deny his sweeping statements as to the signification and use of the English word. We maintain that from the earliest period in the history of our literature, and by our standard writers, temperance has been employed in the sense of abstinence. One of the very earliest English authors was Sir Thomas Elyot,* whose "Governor," first published in 1531, contains the following striking passage, (bk. iii, chap. 19:) "He that is temperate, fleeth pleasures voluptuous, and with the absence of them is not discontented, and from the presence of them he willingly *absteyneth*." Milton also, in his "Samson Agonistes," (1671,) applies the term "temperance" to the abstinent life of his Nazarite hero, (lines 548–554:)

Chor. O madness, to think use of strongest wines
And strongest drinks our chief support of health,
When God, with these forbidden, made choice to rear
His mighty champion, strong above compare,
Whose drink was only from the liquid brook.
Sams. But what avail'd this *temperance*, not complete,
Against another object, more enticing?

So the philosopher Hobbes, (1640,) who is an authority unbiased by any total-abstinence agitation, defines ("De Corpore Politico")† "Temperance the habit by which we *abstain* from all things that tend to our destruction; intemperance the contrary vice." Philosophically and practically, both in English and in Latin, temperance means moderation in the use of all good things, and entire abstinence from every thing injurious. And none are guilty of so great a prostitution of this noble word as those who restrict its meaning to the idea of moderation, and then take it as a warrant for their indulgence in alcoholic poison; so that

The selfsame word which bids our lusts obey
Is misapplied to sanctify their sway.

Chancellor Crosby's citation from Cicero‡ establishes the twofold signification of the Latin term. The Roman writer

* *Vide* Hallam, "Literature of Europe," i, 443.
† Hobbes' "English Works," London, 1840, iv, 110. ‡ "A Calm View," etc.

says, ("De Fin.," i, 14, 47:) *Temperantia est quae, in rebus aut expetendis aut fugiendis, rationem ut sequamur monet.* "Temperance is that which warns us to follow reason either in seeking or in *shunning* things." The verb *tempero* and the participial adjective *temperans* are constantly used in Latin with the signification of abstaining. For example, Cæsar writes, ("Bel. Gal.," i, 7,) *temperare ab injuria et maleficio*, "to abstain from outrage and mischief;" Virgil, ("Æn.," ii, 8,) *Quis . . . temperet a lacrimis?* "Who could refrain from tears?" Celsus, ("De Med.," iv, 24,) *a vino, mulso, venere sibi temperare*, "to abstain from wine, mead, and venery."* Etymology as well as usage vindicates the application of this word to the practice of totally abstaining from all intoxicating beverages. Its root, like that of the Latin *templum* and *tempus*, as the great mass of authorities agree,† is found in the Greek τέμνω, (stems τεμ and ταμ,) which signifies to cut off. So true temperance is the cutting off of every evil thing.‡

But it is the Greek term by which the question as to the nature of the temperance which the New Testament inculcates must be decided. That term is ἐγκράτεια. Professor Bumstead defines it§ as "'being in strength' to resist all temptation to excess in any thing," and calls that "the New Testament idea of temperance." To be sure he adds, "In a broad sense it might include abstinence as one of its occasional manifestations, but abstinence was not the strict sense of the word." We claim that it *was* "the strict sense of the word" when used with reference to any thing injurious or unlawful. When applied to things innocent and permissible it then carried the sense of moderate indulgence. The Greek term, like the English and the Latin, has a twofold signification, varying according to its application. It is being "in strength" to refuse the evil and to discreetly use the good. And the former requires no less moral power than the latter. This definition is abundantly sustained by the usage of the best ethical writers among

* Cf. also Plautus, ("Poen.," prol. 33;) Tacitus, (H. i, 63;) Livy, (H. xxvi, 22, 14,) etc.

† Vanicek, "Etymologisches Handwörterbuch." Leipsic, 1877, p. 273 f.; Curtius, "Griechische Etymologie," *s. v.*; Harpers' "Latin Dictionary," *s. v.*

‡ Cf. Matt. v, 30, ἔκκοψον, cut it off, etc.

§ "Bibliotheca Sacra," January, 1881, p. 89.

the Greeks. Xenophon ("Mem.," iv, 5, 11) quotes Socrates as defining the law of temperance (*ἐγκρατέσι μόνοις ἔξεστι*, literally, "what is lawful to the temperate alone") as *τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ προαιρεῖσθαι, τῶν δὲ κακῶν ἀπέχεσθαι*, "to choose the good and to abstain from the bad." Aristotle ("Eth. Nic.," vii, 1, 6) says: *Ὁ μὲν ἀκρατὴς, εἰδὼς ὅτι φαῦλα, πράττει διὰ πάθος· ὁ δ' ἐγκρατὴς, εἰδὼς ὅτι φαῦλαι αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι, οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ διὰ τὸν λόγον*, "The intemperate, knowing that things are bad, does them at the instigation of passion; the temperate, knowing that the desires are bad, refuses to follow them in obedience to reason." Sextus Empiricus ("Ad. Phys.," i, 153) defines *ἐγκράτεια* as *ἀρετὴ ὑπεράνω ποιοῦσα ἡμᾶς τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι δυσαποσχέτων*, "The virtue which renders us superior to those things which seem hard to be abstained from." Diogenes Laertius, according to Suidas,* makes this distinction: *ἡ σωφροσύνη ἡ ρεμαίας ἔχει τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ἡ δὲ ἐγκράτεια σφοδρὰς*, "Sobriety exercises mastery over the less vehement, temperance over the stronger, passions." Suidas himself defines *ἐγκράτεια* † as *ἡ τῶν κακῶν ἀποχή*, "abstinence from evil." ‡

The Hellenistic writers likewise employ this term in the sense of abstinence. In the LXX the verb *ἐγκρατεύομαι* is used to render the Hebrew אִפַּק, *aphaq*, (Gen. xliii, 31,) "he restrained himself." In the apocryphal book of Ecclesiasticus the section beginning with chap. xviii, ver. 30, has for its heading *Ἐγκράτεια Ψυχῆς*, "Temperance of Soul." It opens thus: *Ὀπίσω τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν σου μὴ πορεύου, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέξεών σου κωλύου*, "Go not after thy lusts, but refrain thyself from thy appetites." This is abstinence. Josephus calls the total abstinence of the Essenes ("Bel. Jud.," ii, 8) *τὴν ἐγκράτειαν*. That

* "Lexicon," *s. v.* † Ibid.

‡ Among the numerous definitions of this term by modern authorities we quote the following: Schrevelius, ("Lex.," *s. v.*,) "*Continentia, temperantia, moderatio.*" Byzantius, ("Greek-French Lex.,") "*Continence, tempérance, abstinence.*" The same author, in his "Greek Dic.," Athens, 1839, defines *νηφάλιος* as *ὁ μὴ πίνων οἶνον, ἐγκρατής*. Pickering, ("Lex.," *s. v.*,) "Continence, temperance." Chassang defines *ἐγκρατής* as "*Qui sait resister á la volupte*," one who knows how to resist pleasure. Liddell and Scott, ("Lex.," *s. v.*,) "Moderation in sensual pleasures, self-control, abstinence from or in a thing." Rosenmüller, ("Comm.," *in* 1 Cor., vii, 9,) "*Ab aliqua re sibi temperare, abstinere*," "To refrain from any thing, to abstain." Bloomfield, ("Resc. Syn.", *in* 2 Pet. i, 6,) "Temperance in the use of pleasure, and, if need be, abstinence from it." Alford, ("Greek Test.," *in* Gal. v, 23,) "The *holding in* of the lusts and desires."

large sect in the ancient Church distinguished for their abstinence and celibacy were called Ἐγκρατεῖς, or Ἐγκρατίται, a fact which must be regarded as demonstrative of the significance and use of this term. It was also regularly employed by the patristic writers to denote a state of continence and to describe those who refused marriage. Instances of this usage are found in Justin Martyr, ("Apol.," i, 29,) Chrysostom, ("Epist.," ii, ad "Olympiad,") Clement, ("Strom.," iii.) *

The New Testament writers do not depart from this idea of abstinence in their employment of *ἐγκράτεια*. The word first occurs in Acts xxiv, 25, as one of the topics of Paul's sermon before Felix and Drusilla. The character and crimes of that guilty pair suggest the sense in which the apostle must have used the term. He was speaking to a man whose cruelty and lust had made him notorious.† Moderation was not his theme, but continence—the duty of total abstinence from all unlawful, sinful, sexual indulgence. Wycliffe correctly renders *ἐγκράτεια* in this passage by "chastitie," in which he is followed by the Rheims version.‡ Four or five years previous to the delivery of this discourse, when writing to the Corinthian Church, Paul had employed the verb *ἐγκρατεύομαι* to describe this same virtue of chastity, (1 Cor. vii, 9.) It is quite accurately rendered in the R. V.: "But if they have not continency," etc. Bloomfield's remarks on its signification in this connection are important. He says:§ "This is rendered by many '*non-continent;*' by others, '*non continere possunt*,' which seems preferable. Paræus says it is used *potentialiter*. The truth is, the *potentiality* is inherent in the very nature of the word. For *ἐγκρατής* signifies one who is *ἐν κράτει*, 'in possession of power.' Thus *εἰ οὐκ ἐγκρατεύονται*, 'if they are not in possession of power,' namely, *to abstain*. So the term comes to be synonymous with *ἀνέχεσθαι*," (*ἀπέχεσθαι*?) In this same Epistle to the Corinthians Paul uses the verb a second time, and in a way which shows that the New Testament idea of

* *Vide* Suicer, "Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus," i, 998, for numerous quotations from the fathers of passages in which *ἐγκρατεύομαι* is used in this sense.

† Tacitus says of him, (H., v, 9,) "*Per omnem saevitiam et libidinem.*"

‡ Kuinoel ("Comm.," *in loc.*) cites Xenophon, "Ages," v, 4, *περὶ τῶν ἀφροδισίων ἐγκράτειας αὐτοῦ*, as an instance of the use of *ἐγκράτεια* in the sense of chastity, rare in the classical writings.

§ "Rescensio Synoptica," vi, 386.

temperance must include abstinence.* He says, (1 Cor. ix, 25,) "Every man that striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things," *πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται*. It is true that this passage is often quoted in favor of the moderate use of alcoholic beverages, but never was there a greater perversion of Scripture. It gives the whole weight of its sanction to the practice of the strictest abstinence from every thing that can intoxicate or in any wise injure. The text alludes to the training of the competitors in the ancient games. The severity of the discipline to which they subjected themselves is described by Epictetus, ("Encheiridion," 35:) "Do you wish to win the Olympic prize? It is necessary to observe a strict discipline, to eat what is prescribed, abstain (*ἀπέχεσθαι*) from all confections, exercise at the appointed hour in heat and in cold, drink nothing cold, nor wine, (*μὴ οἶνον*,) as you are wont," etc. So Horace ("Ars Poetica," 414) says that the athlete *abstinuit venere et vino*, "abstained from venery and wine." † The earlier versions recognized the true significance of the verb in this passage. The Vulgate renders *abstinet;* and Wycliffe, followed by Tyndale, Cranmer, and the Geneva version, renders "absteyneth." Conybeare and Howson ‡ render, "He trains himself by all manner of self-restraint." In the very next verse (26) Paul illustrates and makes personal application of the doctrine of Christian temperance. Continuing the figure of the preceding passage, he says: § "So run I, straight for the goal. I aim straight blows, and not in feint, at the enemy. I even blacken my own body with blows, and lead it about as a slave, lest, in any way, after acting as herald to others I myself

* Professor Bumstead objects ("Bib. Sac.," January, 1881, p. 89) to the doctrine that the New Testament teaches total abstinence on the ground that the verb *ἀπέχομαι*, which "the New Testament writers" used "to express the idea of wholly abstaining is never used in connection with wine." If he means that it is the *only* verb which expresses that idea, we dissent, and point to *ἐγκρατεύομαι*. If he means to claim that the use of wine as a beverage is not included in the text which he quotes (1 Pet. ii, 11) we again dissent. We would also call his attention to the fact that the verb *ἀπέχομαι* is used, (1 Thess. v, 22, "Abstain from every species [or R. V., "form," *εἴδους*] of evil") in immediate connection (ver. 6) with the injunction "Be sober," *νήφωμεν*, covering the evil of drinking and every other evil, whether named or omitted.

† *Vide* also Ælian, "Variæ Historiæ," xi, 3.

‡ "Life and Epistles of St. Paul."

§ Adapted from Farrar's rendering, "The Life and Work of St. Paul," p. 392.

should be rejected from the lists." Surely this is no indulgent or luxurious notion of temperance as a prudent pampering of the body. It is stern, self-denying discipline. So far apart are the apostle's and the chancellor's conception of this Christian virtue! The other passages in which *ἐγκράτεια* occurs are Gal. v, 22, where it stands as the completion and crown of "the fruits of the Spirit," which are in opposition to "the works of the flesh," enumerated in the preceding verse, and among which "drunkenness" is prominent; and 2 Pet. i, 6, where it is classed among the chorus of graces, and is rendered in the Vulgate *abstinentia*, and by Wycliffe "absteynence." The adjective form, *ἐγκρατῆ*, occurs once, in Titus i, 8, where it answers to *νηφάλεος* in 1 Tim. iii, 2.

From this inquiry, therefore, the conclusion is irresistible that the temperance of the New Testament is a power in and over one's self moderately to use all innocent things and absolutely to abstain from all that is injurious. Applied to intoxicating beverages it can have but one signification. Here the New Testament insists upon total abstinence. This is Christ's teaching by the Holy Spirit, and there can be no doubt that his practice conformed to his precepts, and that, so far from being a moderate drinker, he was, what he commands each one of his followers to be,

A Total Abstainer.

APPENDIX.

A.

Alcohol in Health and as a Food.

(Pp. 4–7.)

We submit some further and recent evidence from the scientific and medical stand-point as to the harmfulness of alcohol in any shape or quantity in health, and as to its utter uselessness as a food. An editorial in "The London Lancet," the leading medical journal of Great Britain, of Jan. 1, 1881, p. 28, says:

> The most rigid teetotaler may well be satisfied with the growing tendency in physicians to use it (alcohol) strictly, and to be satisfied only with distinct proofs of its utility; and the most generous believer in the medicinal virtues of alcohol must know that the public and individual patients are taking a keener interest in this question than they ever did before, and are making very shrewd personal experiments on the subject. Our own opinion concerning it has been freely expressed, and we have not concealed our conviction that *good health is most consistent with very little alcohol or with none;* that he who uses alcohol freely or frequently, or by itself and apart from food, is surely laying up disease and degeneration for himself and probably for his descendants.

Frank Woodbury, M.D., Physician to the German Hospital, Philadelphia, in a paper on "Clinical Phases of Poisoning by Alcohol," published in "The Philadelphia Medical Times" of April 9, 1881, says, "Alcoholic liquors are poisonous because they contain alcohol." And, after stating that he has personally repeated the experiments of Anstie, Parkes, and Wollowicz, he declares: "I am, therefore, forced to the conclusion that alcohol is not a true food in the sense that it favors nutrition in a state of health."

R. Greene, M.D., of Boston, in a paper on "Alcoholic Stimulants as Medicines," read before one of the medical societies at the annual meeting, Boston, June 8, 1881, and published by the author, asserts:

Alcohol is neither food nor medicine. It cannot add one molecule to the plasm out of which our bodies are daily built up. On the contrary, it exerts upon the whole animal economy a most deleterious influence. It does not supply, but diminishes, vital force. It weakens the nerves, deadens the sensibilities, and lessens the power of the system to resist disease or to recover from its effects.

At the thirty-first annual meeting of the Illinois State Medical Society, held May, 1881, and reported in "The New York Medical Record," July 23, 1881, "Dr. E. Ingalls, who had corresponded with all the leading members of the society regarding the use of alcohol, said *alcohol should not be used in health*, and physicians should discountenance its use by their example and by their precept."

Dr. B. W. Richardson, of England, thus sums up the "Results of Researches on Alcohol," in an address published by the National Temperance Society, 1882, pp. 19–21:

What I may call the preliminary and physiological part of my research was now concluded. I had learned, purely by experimental observation, that in its action on the living body this chemical substance, alcohol, deranges the constitution of the blood, unduly excites the heart and respiration, paralyzes the minute blood-vessels, increases and decreases, according to the degree of its application, the functions of the digestive organs, of the liver, and of the kidneys, disturbs the regularity of nervous action, lowers the animal temperature, and lessens the muscular power.

Such, independently of any prejudice of party or influence of sentiment, are the unanswerable teachings of the sternest of all evidences, the evidences of experiment, of natural fact revealed to man by experimental testing of natural phenomena. If alcohol had never been heard of, as nitrite of amyl and many other chemical substances I have tested had never been heard of by the masses of mankind, this is the evidence respecting alcohol which I should have collected, and these are the facts I should have recorded from the evidence.

This record of simple experimental investigation and result respecting the action of alcohol on the body were incomplete without two other observations, which come in as a natural supplement. It will be asked: Was there no evidence of any useful service rendered by the agent in the midst of so much obvious evidence of bad service? I answer to that question that there was no such evidence whatever, and there is none. It has been urged, as a last kind of resource and excuse, that alcohol aids digestion, and so far is useful. I support, in reply, the statement of the late Dr. Cheyne, that nothing more effectively hinders

digestion than alcohol. That "many hours, and even a whole night, after a debauch in wine, it is common enough to reject a part or the whole of a dinner undigested." I hold that those who abstain from alcohol have the best digestion; and that more instances of indigestion, of flatulency, of acidity, and of depression of mind and body, are produced by alcohol than by any other single cause.

This excuse removed, there remains none other for alcohol that is reasonably assignable except that temporary excitement of mind which, in spite of the assumption of its jollity and happiness, is one of the surest ultimate introductions to pain and sorrow. But if there be no excuse favored by scientific research on behalf of alcohol, there is sufficient of appalling reasons against it superadded when the pathological results of its use are surveyed upon the physiological. The mere question of the destructive effect of alcohol on the membranes of the body alone would be a sufficient study for an address on the mischiefs of it. I cannot define it better, indeed, than to say that it is an agent as potent for evil as it is helpless for good. It begins by destroying, it ends by destruction, and it implants organic changes which progress independently of its presence even in those who are not born.

Dr. James Muir Howie, of Liverpool, in a recent paper on "Stimulants and Narcotics," published by the National Temperance Society, New York, 1882, in discussing the theory of Anstie and others that alcohol is oxidized within the body, and by the generation of force thus supplies the place of a food, says in conclusion, (p. 10 :)

In the face of such well-attested facts and experiences as I have just narrated, it is quite impossible to believe that alcohol *adds* the smallest amount of energy to any man, either healthy or diseased. Moreover, the evidence just adduced strongly supports the conclusion that it is not merely useless for such a purpose, but that it is positively injurious.

The reason of its baneful effect lies in the fact that it liberates nervous energy more rapidly than it can be made use of, and thus, when the energy is desiderated for further exertion it is not forthcoming. In fact, it spends nerve-power as quickly as it is spent when a man is undergoing hard bodily or mental labor. If, therefore, any man works hard and drinks hard at the same time he will feel doubly exhausted when his day comes to an end.

In regard to the same question concerning the value of alcohol as a food, Dr. James Edmunds, of London, in his "Diet for Mothers : Including the Question of Alcholic Drinks," writes, (pp. 12–14 :)

Speaking honestly, I cannot, by the argument yet presented to me, admit the alcohols through any gate that might distinguish them as apart from other chemical bodies. I can no more accept them as foods than I can chloroform, or ether, or methylal. That they produce a temporary excitement is true, but as their general action is quickly to reduce animal heat, I cannot see how they can supply animal force. I see clearly how they reduce animal power, and can show a reason for using them in order to stop physical pain, or to stupefy mental pain; but that they give strength, *i. e.*, that they supply material for construction of fine tissue, or throw force into tissues supplied by other material —must be an error as solemn as it is widespread. . . .

If this view be adopted, it follows that alcohol never yields up force in the body as a food on the one hand; and that it never acts as a stimulant by supplying force on the other. All the observations which I have been able to make impress me with the conviction that, at any rate, the drug-action of alcohol is that of a narcotic, and not that of a stimulant; but in case it should hereafter be proved that alcohol does undergo oxidation in the body so as to yield up force, and thereby serves to some extent as food, the total abstainer's platform would still remain unshaken. We should then inquire, firstly, Is alcohol a good food? Every medical man would reply that alcohol is certainly the cause of most of those degenerations of blood and tissue which constitute the diseases of the present day—a charge which cannot be brought against any other substance that ranks as a food; and there is no doubt that the physical injury resulting from the use of alcohol as a food would far outweigh the benefits which its possible yielding up of force might give. We should ask, secondly, Is alcohol a cheap food? The reply would be that you could get as much food in a pennyworth of oatmeal, beef suet, or sugar, as you could in a shilling's-worth of alcohol. We should ask, thirdly, Is alcohol a safe food? The reply would be that, while gluttony and other abuses of true foods are practically very trifling evils, and evils, moreover, which seem to have a natural tendency to cure themselves, the drunkenness and other evils which arise out of the drinking usages of society are admitted on all hands to be the greatest curse with which society is at present afflicted, and to be evils, moreover, which have a tendency to perpetuate and aggravate themselves, instead of curing themselves. Therefore, if alcohol were a food, it would be an injurious food, a dear food, and a dangerous food.

That is to say, it is not a food at all, for "an injurious food" is a contradiction in terms.

Dr. W. B. Carpenter, of England, in a lecture delivered in Tremont Temple, Boston, December 3, 1882, and reported in the "Daily Advertiser," (December 4,) said:

Any one who is familiar with the action of poison upon the living animal body and has made that a subject of special study, has not the smallest hesitation in saying that alcohol is a poison. There are any number of well-attested results of its administration experimentally upon animals, in which it is shown that it is a poison. Yet it may be thought by many of you that if it is a poison its action is very, very slow when taken in small, continued, repeated doses. I admit that freely. It is a very, very slow poison in the great majority of instances; but I do not regard its action as any less sure because it is slow. After very large experience, experience of our life-insurance companies, of our benefit societies—and I think you have similar institutions in this country, a sort of mutual insurance for workingmen, for payment during sickness—the experience of all these is entirely in this direction, that life is shortened and disease induced, and the body, even, very materially injured, by indulgence in alcoholic liquors.

B.

Alcohol and Life Insurance.

(P. 7.)

The following is the passage from Parke's "Manual of Practical Hygiene," p. 270, (fifth edition, 1878, p. 291,) referred to in the foot-note on p. 7 of this work:

Very striking evidence in favor of total abstinence, as contrasted with moderation, is given by the statistics of the United Kingdom Temperance and General Provident Institution. One section consists of abstainers, another of persons selected as not known to be intemperate. The claims for five years (1865–1870) anticipated in the temperance section were £100,446, but there were actually only claims for £72,676. In the general section the anticipated claims were £196,352, and the actual claims were £230,297. The much greater longevity of the abstainer is better seen by the amount of bonuses paid to each £1,000 whole-life policy in the two sections for the same five years:

Age at Entrance.	Premiums paid.			Bonus added in Temperance Section.			Bonus added in General Section.		
	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*	£	*s.*	*d.*
15	83	2	6	61	1	0	35	10	0
20	93	6	8	64	0	0	37	0	0
25	106	9	2	68	10	0	40	0	0
30	122	1	8	74	0	0	43	0	0
35	138	19	2	78	19	0	46	0	0
40	162	5	10	86	0	0	50	4	0
45	188	10	10	92	18	0	54	0	0
50	226	5	0	104	2	0	60	13	0
55	284	3	4	122	14	0	71	11	0

At every age, therefore, the abstainer has a very great advantage.

Professor William James, in his Harvard College lectures, states * that insurance statistics for a given period show that where calculations from the tables of mortality anticipated the death of 1,110 abstainers, only 801 did die; but where the death of 2,010 ordinary people was anticipated, 1,997 actually died. The contrast in this case, it must be remembered, is not between abstainers and drunkards, who are never insured, but between abstainers and moderate drinkers.

At the Dublin meeting of the National Association for the Promotion of Social Science in 1881 Dr. Cosgrove, of the University of Dublin, in a paper on "The Use of Alcoholic Stimulants in Irish Workhouses," said: † "Insurance statistics and army and benefit club experiences show that a total abstainer is, *cæteris paribus*, not only very much healthier than a drunkard, but also appreciably a better life than a moderate drinker."

C.

The Use of Fresh Grape-Juice as a Beverage.

(P. 21.)

We have referred to Dr. Duff as one of the authorities for our statement that the pure juice of the grape, freshly expressed, is used as a beverage in wine-bearing districts to this day. The passage is found in his "Life," by Smith, vol. i, p. 392. It was written in the south of France, where he was sojourning in 1839. It is as follows:

> Look at the peasant at his meals in vine-bearing districts! Instead of milk he has before him a basin of the pure, unadulterated "blood of the grape." In this, its native and original state, it is a plain, simple, and wholesome liquid, which at every repast becomes to the husbandman what milk is to the shepherd —not a luxury but a necessary, not an intoxicating but a nutritive beverage.

* Boston "Daily Advertiser," May 19, 1881.

† "Transactions," etc. London, 1882, p. 650.

This would certainly seem to be a very plain and unmistakable piece of testimony to the custom as we have alleged. But, under the exigencies of their position, those who deny the use of unfermented wine appealed to Dr. Duff to state "if he meant that the wine so described by him was really unfermented; and he replied," says Dr. Moore, whom we are quoting,* "in unambiguous terms that he intended to convey no such idea." This is his language :†

> On inquiry I found it was the pure juice of the grape, which, as you know, ferments spontaneously when expressed from the husk—fermented, therefore, but still pure, that is, wholly undrugged or unadulterated with any extraneous matter of any kind. It was also very weak, that is, contained very little spirit, but still enough to preserve it. Being so weak, and so free from all adulterating mixtures, and taken in the manner in which I saw it taken, it was utterly incapable of intoxicating a child, and constituted a wholesome, refreshing beverage, instead of milk, which was not to be had in that quarter. That is the sum and substance of what I wrote, or meant to write. Such a thing as unfermented wine I never heard of in any country.

Notwithstanding the purpose for which this second statement was made, we regard it as strongly corroborative of the first, and of the fact in evidence of which we have cited that. There is nothing contradictory of it in this supplementary testimony. It contains no new information save that concerning the fermented condition of the grape-juice partaken of by the peasant, and this is stated not as a *fact*, but simply as an *inference*. "On inquiry" he "found it was the pure juice of the grape." That was all, and had already been certified to. But this juice, "as you know, ferments spontaneously when expressed from the husk—[and was] fermented *therefore*." This is not merely an inference, but an illegitimate one, since the premise from which it is drawn is false. By "spontaneously" Dr. Duff evidently meant immediately, and this, we have already shown, is not the fact, (p. 65.) As Professor Dittmar says, "Spontaneous fermentation is always *slow* in beginning." ‡ That Dr. Duff had never heard of "such a thing as unfermented wine" does not bear upon the case in hand. It is the thing itself and not its name about which we are now con-

* "Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 99 † Ibid.

‡ "Encyclopedia Britannica," ninth ed., article "Fermentation."

cerneo. The unfermented character of this beverage of the husbandman is still further confirmed and made certain by the additional statement that "it was utterly incapable of intoxicating a child," which could not be true of any liquor that had begun the active process of fermentation.

But we are not dependent upon Dr. Duff exclusively for our proof of the use in modern times of the fresh grape-juice as a beverage. Dr. Kerr tells us,

> In many parts of France *vin boueux*, (muddy wine,) commonly called *vin bourru*, is drunk by the peasantry like milk: muddy, not from fermentation, but simply from the pulp and seeds being mixed with the juice, the skins being strained off. This wine remains, in ordinary weather, unfermented and non-alcoholic for from twenty to fifty hours, and is evidently the wine described by Philip Miller, F.R.S., in 1768, in these words: "Vin-bourra, as they call it, (that is, a new and sweet wine that has not worked,) which they sell while it is quite hot." ("Gard. Dict.," 8th ed., article "Vitis.")*

So the celebrated canoeist and traveler, Macgregor, writes:

> At one of the great inns on the road some new wine was produced on the table. It had been made only the day before, and its color was exactly that of cold tea with milk and sugar in it, while its taste was very luscious and sweet. The new wine is sometimes in request, but especially among women.†

Dr. Moore, after denying that "unfermented wine is a common and favorite beverage in various European countries, and particularly in France and Italy, at the present day,"‡ and offering a reward of one hundred dollars "to any one who will bring reliable testimony from Syria that the natives of that country are in the habit of drinking it [unchanged grape-juice] as their form of wine"§—a very carefully guarded proposition, by the way—asserts that "if this were the case, it would not establish the existence of such a drink in Palestine at and before the time of our Saviour's appearance on the earth."‖ We insist, on the other hand, that if this were proved *not* to be the case it would fail to

* "Unfermented Wine a Fact," p. 39.

† "A Thousand Miles in the Rob Roy Canoe." London, 1866, p. 215.

‡ "Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 98.

§ "Daily Record," Philadelphia, May 27, 1882.

‖ "Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 98.

disprove the existence and use of such a drink in Palestine at and before the time of our Saviour's appearance on the earth. It would be well if both sides would bear in mind that it is ancient customs and not modern habits which are in controversy. We know that in many instances the latter have diverged widely from the former. It would not be strange if they had done so in this case. And yet the evidence, as we understand it, does not favor such a view. The testimony we have just adduced of Dr. Duff and others establishes the existence of the custom of drinking unfermented grape-juice in wine countries at the present day. To this should be added the testimony of Dr. Jacobus, cited on page 57 of this work, and founded on the witness' personal observation and experience, and also that of Dr. Kerr, who says,* "I have myself imported unfermented grape-juice from the East for the use of my family."

Now, equally ample and authoritative evidence of the prevalence of the same practice in ancient times is at hand. The use of the freshly expressed grape-juice as a beverage in the Egypt of Pharaoh's time is proven, as we have seen, (p. 21,) by Scriptural record confirmed by monumental inscriptions. Sir Edward Barry says :† "The grapes became at first a useful part of their (the ancients') aliment, and the recent expressed juice a cooling drink." E. Lankester, M.D., F.R.S., writes :‡ "The ancients, also, there can be little doubt, were in the habit of drinking the expressed juice of the grape before fermentation." Dr. Forbiger, an eminent German authority on the manners and customs of antiquity, testifies :§ "Je älter der Wein war, fur desto vorzüglicher galt er; doch wurde auch schon der Most, besonders der noch von dem Keltern von selbst abfliessende, sehr gern getrunken;" "The older the wine was the more highly was it esteemed; but on the other hand, also, must, especially that which flowed spontaneously from the press, was very eagerly drank." Dr. William Smith tells us,‖ on the authority of Columella (xii, 41) and the "Geoponica,"

* "Wines Scriptural and Ecclesiastical," p. 33.

† "Observations on the Wines of the Ancients." London, 1775, p. 27.

‡ "Food." London, 1861, p. 229.

§ "Hellas und Rom." Leipsic, 1876, iv, 118.

‖ "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," article "Vinum."

(vi, 16,) that "A portion of the must was used at once, being drunk fresh after it had been clarified with vinegar." We will close this line of evidence with the testimony of Dr. Lyman Abbot, who is far from agreeing with us in our general positions. He thus describes the wines of Palestine :*

> First there was fermented wine. It contained, what is the only objectionable element in modern wines, a percentage of alcohol. *It was the least common*, and the percentage of alcohol was small. Second were the new wines. *These, like our new cider, were wholly without alcohol, and were not intoxicating.* They were easily preserved in this condition for several months. Third were wines in which, by boiling or by drugs, the process of fermentation was prevented and alcohol excluded. These answering somewhat in composition and character to our raspberry shrub, were mixed with water, *and constituted the most common drink of the land.*

The italics are ours. We regard the passage as a very candid and correct statement of the real facts in the case.

D.

The Position of our Opponents.

(P. 31.)

That we have not misstated the position of our opponents in this controversy on "The Bible Wine Question," a position which they must hold in its full integrity or surrender unconditionally, is made certain by what Dr. A. A. Hodge writes in the editorial pages of the "Presbyterian Review," April, 1882, p. 395. He declares: "The single point essential to the position of Dr. Moore and those who sympathize with him is the fact that *the word 'wine' means only and always juice of the grape fermented*, and that the same was made and drunk by Christ, and used by him as one of the elements of the Last Supper."

* "A Life of Christ," p. 109. Second edition. Harper & Brothers. 1882.

E.

Unfermented Juice of the Grape Defined as Wine.

(Pp. 32–34.)

We have shown in the foregoing pages that the fresh and unfermented juice of the grape, known as γλεῦκος among the Greeks, and *mustum* among the Romans, was in that age scientifically recognized and described as wine. We propose now to show that the modern authorities on the subject take precisely the same position with reference to the ancient beverage and its modern equivalents.

We quote authoritative definitions of

I. The Greek Γλεῦκος.

1. Donnegan, (1826,) "New, unfermented wine, must."
2. Passow, (Leipzig, 1841,) "Most, ungegohrener od. eingekochter süssur Wein," Unfermented or boiled sweet wine.
3. Pickering, (1846,) "New wine, must, a sweet juice or liquor."
4. Liddell and Scott, (New York, 1870,) "Lat., *Mustum*, must, i. e., sweet new wine."
5. Sophocles, in his "Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods," (Boston, 1870,) does not give γλεῦκος, but defines "γλευκίνος, (γλεῦκος,) of new wine or must."
6. Chassang, (Paris, 1877,) "*Vin doux*," Sweet wine.
7. Alexandre, (Paris, 1880,) "*Vin doux*."
8. Young, ("Analyt. Concordance," 1880,) "Sweet or new wine."

II. The Latin *Mustum*.

1. Littleton, (London, 1678,) "s. c. *Vinum*, new wine close shut up and not suffered to work."
2. Lüneman, (Leipzig, 1780,) "Der most, junge wein," Must, new wine.
3. Forcellini, (Patavii, 1827,) "*Vinum novum, nondum purgatum*, Mosto, vino nuovo, γλεῦκος.
4. Ainsworth, (1835,) "Wine coming from the grape before pressing."
5. Valpy, (Cambridge, 1838,) "*Mustus*, new, fresh, young. Hence, *mustum*, i. e., *vinum*, fresh wine, as *merum* for *merum vinum*."

6. Freund, (Leipzig, 1845,) "Junger, unabgegohrener Wein, most," New unfermented wine, must.
7. Andrews, (1860,) "s. c. *Vinum*, new or unfermented wine, must."
8. Rich, ("Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," London, 1860,) "New wine not yet fermented and racked off from the lees."
9. White and Riddle, (London, 1870,) (s. c. vinum,) "New, fresh, or unfermented wine, must."
10. Smith, (London, 1870,) "New or unfermented wine, must."
11. Vanicek, (Leipzig, 1877,) "Der junge unabgegohrener Wein," New, unfermented wine.
12. Harper's "Latin Dictionary," (1880,) "New or unfermented wine, must."

III. The French *Moût.*

1. "Dic. de l'Académie Française," "Vin qui vient d'être fait, et qui n'a point encore fermenté," Wine which has just been made and which has not yet fermented.
2. Littre, (Paris, 1863,) "Du Lat. *mustum: vinum mustum*, vin nouveau, non fermenté," From the Latin *mustum:* must wine, new wine, not fermented.
3. Spier and Surenne, (1865,) "Must, unfermented wine."

IV. The Italian *Mosto.*

1. Fanfani, (Firenze, 1865,) "Sugo tratto dall' uva pigiata e che non ha ancor bollito. Vale anche vino," Juice pressed from the crushed grape and which has not yet fermented. It is also wine.

V. The German *Most.*

1. Heyse, (Magdeburg, 1833,) "Von dem Lat. *mustum*, scil. *vinum*, d. i. neuer Wein," From the Latin *mustum, vinum* understood, that is, new wine.
2. Jürgens, (Braunschweig, 1877,) "Lat., *mustum*, nämlich *vinum*, Wein—ein junger, süsser Wein," Latin, *mustum*, namely *vinum*, wine, a new, sweet wine.
3. Adler, (New York, 1845,) "Must, new wine not fermented."

VI. The English Must.

1. Johnson, (1785,) "New wine."
2. Walker, (1818,) "New wine."
3. Ogilvie, ("Imperial Dictionary," 1853,) "New wine, wine pressed from the grape, but not fermented."
4. Webster, (1870,) "Wine pressed from the grape, but not fermented."
5. Worcester, (1870,) "The sweet or unfermented juice of the grape, new wine."
6. Longmuir, (1877,) "New wine, unfermented."
7. Nuttall, (1878,) "Wine from the grape, not fermented."
8. Skeats, ("Etymological Dictionary," 1882,) "New wine."

But it is unnecessary to further multiply examples. Everywhere the freshly expressed, unfermented juice of the grape is recognized and defined as wine by scholars, scientists, lexicographers, encyclopedists, and the people generally.

F.

Γλεῦκος in the New Testament.

(P. 51.)

Our brief allusion to the use of γλεῦκος in the New Testament has been misapprehended, and the inquiry made whether "confirms" should not be "refutes" in our statement of its significance. To make the whole subject plain, and to vindicate our interpretation of the term in the single instance of its occurrence in the Gospel writings, we can do no better than to quote in full the very clear and conclusive explanation of Professor Bumstead, (Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan., 1881, p. 81,) to which we merely adverted in the text:

Γλεῦκος. This, as in classic Greek, corresponds to the Latin *mustum*, meaning the newly expressed juice of the grape, and so has a less wide range of meaning than *tirosh* or *asis*. It occurs only once, and I see no necessity for trying to prove it intoxicating, as some have done, including Robinson. Others mocking said, "These men are full of γλεῦκος," (Acts ii, 13.) The irony of this charge seems to be clearly indicated by the word "mocking," and the meaning to be: "These men, too abstemious, forsooth, to touch any thing stronger, have made themselves

drunk on grape-juice." If this was not the point of their "mocking," how can the use of γλεῦκος instead of the common word οἶνος, be accounted for? Vicar Bevan says, "St. Peter would hardly have offered a serious defense to an accusation that was not seriously made."* But Peter replies, not to the absurdity of getting drunk on grape-juice, but to the *real* charge which that absurdity so satirically covers up, namely, that they were drunk on *something*. "These men are not drunken, as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day." It seems to me that Alford and others, in arguing for the intoxicating character of γλεῦκος as a *sweet* wine, have lost sight of the classical distinction already pointed out (p. 62) between γλεῦκος = *mustum*, sweet, because unfermented, grape-juice, and οἶνος γλυκύς = sweet wine, so called because, though fermented, it was rich in sugar.

We cannot fail to see in such a charge as this of getting drunk on grape-juice, as though that were their usual beverage, and this the unusual result of indulging in it, an indirect but a very important piece of testimony to the total abstinence habits of the apostles, and so inferentially to the like practice of their great Teacher and Exemplar. This is confirmed by what Eusebius tells us, on the authority of Hegesippus, concerning the Apostle James, the brother of the Lord and author of the General Epistle. He says, ("Hist. Eccl.," ii, 23,) Οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιεν οὐδὲ ἔμψυχον ἔφαγεν, "Wine and sikera he did not drink, neither did he eat animal food." Traces of this same spirit and practice of abstinence are very perceptible in the Epistles of Peter. (1 Pet. i, 13; iv, 3, 7; v, 8; 2 Pet. i, 6.)

G.

The Color of Grape-Juice.

(Pp. 49 and 81.)

Dr. Moore says, ("Presbyterian Review," January, 1882, p. 88:) "Red wine is the *blood* of the grape. Now we have not been able to find an unfermented wine that is red. The *juice* of the purple grape is not red, but the coloring matter is in the husks, and can be extracted only by acid and alcohol or wine. It is not soluble in the unfermented juice."

The first statement is preposterous in the face of what follows. If grape-juice can have no color until after fermenta-

* Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," article "Wine."

tion, and if color be essential to the symbolism of blood, then such a thing as "the blood of the grape" is literally impossible and figuratively unmeaning. "Red wine," which, on the doctor's hypothesis, can be the result only of carefully-conducted chemical processes, has no more claim to be regarded as "the blood of the grape" than the vinegar or any other subsequent and artificial product of the vine. It does not exist within the grape, nor can it come from it. If, therefore, it be true that fresh grape-juice is colorless, then the point of the symbolism must lie in something else than the color. And such we believe to be the case. As we have already stated, (p. 49,) it is doubtless to be found in the fact that in the juice of the grape, as in the blood of the animal, is the life, (cf. Lev. xvii, 11.) In the instance of the Lord's Supper, as we have also indicated, (p. 83,) the point of the symbolism lies in the being poured out. But while this is true, it is not necessary to reject wholly the thought of color, which, as a most obvious phenomenon, would appeal directly to the senses and the imagination. And this brings us to say that grape-juice is not always colorless. Dr. Moore is not correct in his statements on this point. There are more things in heaven and *earth* than he has dreamed of in his philosophy. There are not a few varieties of grapes whose pulp contains coloring matter soluble in the acid, sugary juice, which is consequently red just as it pours from the cluster.* We may mention the Pineau, grown in Burgundy, which, "when fully ripe, always yields a slightly reddish, rosy, or partridge-eye colored juice, however carefully and quickly it may be pressed."† The Teinturier, extensively grown in France and Spain, yields a "juice of a dark-red color on pressing. It is used for giving a dark color to wines, from which fact comes its name, literally 'the dyer.'"‡ There is also the Spanish grape *Tinta Francisca*, possessing the same characteristics and perhaps the same variety as the Teinturier.§ The Mustang grape of New Mexico, Texas, and Arkansas, contains a blood-red pulp, and yields a very red and acid juice.‖ The juice of the Riparia or River grape, of Texas, is also blood-red.¶ "The Samarcandi, called from the town of that

* *Vide* Thudicum and Dupré "On the Origin, Nature, and Varieties of Wine," p. 256. † Ibid., p. 101. ‡ Ibid., pp. 256, 487, 488. § Ibid., p. 674. ‖ Ibid., p. 728. ¶ Ibid., p. 729.

name, [is] a kind of grape with a black skin with red juice, furnishing the claret wine." *

It is quite probable that grapes of this sort have grown in Judea. Isaiah lxiii, 2, 3, may be regarded as an indication of this fact. In the Apocrypha, also, (1 Macc. vi, 34,) we find described a device which was resorted to for exciting the war elephants: "And to the end that they might provoke the elephants to fight, they showed them the blood of grapes and mulberries." The juice of the grapes and berries must very plainly have been red, or the artifice would have proved a failure.

H.

The Method of the Miracle at Cana.

(P. 54.)

We have been accused of misrepresenting St. Augustine and Chrysostom, ("S. C. B." in "The Record," Philadelphia, July 22, 1882, and "The Independent," August 3, 1882.) That we have not done so in our statement of their interpretation of the miraculous transformation of water into wine at the marriage-feast in Cana of Galilee, is amply evidenced by these authors' own words, which we quote. St. Augustine says, (in "Evang. Joan.," tr. viii:)

Ipse enim fecit vinum illo die in nuptiis in sex illis hydriis quas impleri aqua praecepit, qui omni anno fecit hoc in vitibus. Sicut enim quod miserunt ministri in hydrias, in vinum conversum est opere Domini, sic et quod nubes fundunt, in vinum convertitur ejusdem opere Domini. Illud autem non miramur, quia omni anni fit: assiduitate amisit admirationem. "For the self-same one made wine on that day at the marriage-feast in those six water-pots, which he commanded to be filled with water, who does this every year in vines. For even as that which the servants put into the water-pots was turned into wine by the doing of the Lord, *so in like manner also* is what the clouds pour forth changed into wine by the doing of the same Lord. But we do not wonder at the latter, because it happens every year; it has lost its marvelousness by its constant occurrence."

* Henderson, "History of Ancient and Modern Wine." Lond., 1824. P. 264.

Chrysostom says, ("Hom." xxii, in Joan:)

Δεικνὺς ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐν ταῖς ἀμπέλοις τὸ ὕδωρ μεταβάλλων, καὶ τὸν ὑετὸν διὰ τῆς ῥίζης εἰς οἶνον τρέπων, ὅπερ ἐν τῷ φυτῷ διὰ πολλοῦ χρόνου γίνεται, τοῦτο ἀθρόον ἐν τῷ γάμῳ εἰργάσατο. "Showing that it is he who transmutes water in the vines, and who converts the rain by its passage through the roots into *wine*, who effected that in an instant at the wedding which in the plant is long in doing."

Bishop Hall says, ("Contemplations," p. 117:)

What doth he, in the ordinary way of nature, but turn the watery juice that arises up from the root into wine? He will only do this now, suddenly and at once, which he doth usually by sensible degrees.

Archbishop Trench says, ("On the Miracles," p. 115:)

He who each year prepares the wine in the grape, causing it to absorb and swell with the moisture of earth and heaven, to transmute this into nobler juices of its own, did now concentrate all these slower processes into a single moment, and accomplish in an instant what usually takes many months to accomplish.

Olshausen says, ("Commentary," *in loc.:*)

The only correct conception of this occurrence is that which supposes a real effective influence which only wrought with accelerated rapidity. Hence the fathers justly observe that here nothing else occurred than what is annually displayed in a more gradual development in the vine. In the same way Meyer correctly understands the miracle; and Strauss himself, who at one time could not ridicule it sufficiently, is now compelled, in his third number of the "Streitschriften" (p. 113) against Bauer, to acknowledge the suitableness of supposing an accelerated process of nature. It is self-evident that this supposition neither removes the miracle nor explains it naturally; the essence of the miracle consists in divinely effecting the acceleration of the natural process; the form in which the miracle is exhibited is a more effective medium for its contemplation.

We were in error, misled by Olshausen *ut supra*, in enumerating Meyer among those who adopt Augustine's explanation of the miracle. He does not regard it as a supernatural acceleration of the process of nature.

Dr. Whedon says, ("Comm.," *in loc.:*)

And no doubt Jesus, like the God of nature, created, not the alcohol, which is the poison produced by the putrefying corpse of the dead grape, but the fresh, living, innocent fluid.

Dr. Geikie says, ("Life and Words of Christ," i, 479 :)

The wine which the guests had drunk from the bridegroom's bounty, and possibly from the added gifts of friends, had been slowly matured from the vine by mysterious elaboration from light and heat and moisture and the salts of the earth, none of which had more apparent affinity to it than the water which Jesus transformed. The miracle in nature was not less real or wonderful than that of the wedding-feast, and strikes us less only by its being familiar. At the threshold of Christ's miraculous works it is well to realize a fact so easily overlooked. A miracle is only an exercise in a new way of the Almighty power we see daily producing the same results in nature.

I.

Chrysostom and Bengel on 1 Cor. xi, 21.

(P. 60.)

It has been frequently and positively denied that the above-named expositors give their support to the interpretation of *μεθύω* in 1 Cor. xi, 21, in the generic sense of "surfeited" rather than in the narrow and exclusive sense of "drunken." Dr. Moore can scarcely refrain from charging those who quote them on this side with intentional misrepresentation, ("Presbyterian Review," January, 1881, p. 95.) He himself, however, gives only garbled extracts from these authorities, and deals none too ingenuously with them or with his readers. We quote them in full on this passage, and ask the candid and judicious to decide as to the merits of the case. Chrysostom writes, ("Hom." xxvii, in Epist. ad Cor. :)

Εἰπὼν γὰρ τοῦτο, ἐπήγαγε πάλιν· καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει. ἅπερ ἑκάτερα ἀμετρίας ἦν, καὶ ἡ ἔνδεια καὶ ἡ ὑπερβολή. Ἰδοὺ καὶ δεύτερον ἔγκλημα πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους καταβλάπτον. πρῶτον μὲν, ὅτι τὸ δεῖπνον αὐτῶν ἀτιμάζουσι· δεύτερον δὲ, ὅτι γαστρίζονται καὶ μεθύουσι· καὶ τὸ δὴ χαλεπώτερον, ὅτι καὶ τῶν πενήτων πεινώντων. Ἃ γὰρ ἔμελλε κοινῇ πᾶσι προκεῖσθαι, ταῦτα οὗτοι μόνοι σιτοῦμενοι, καὶ εἰς ἀπληστίαν καὶ εἰς μέθην ἐξέβαινον. Διὸ οὐδὲ εἶπεν, ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ κορέννυται, ἀλλὰ μεθύει. Τούτων δὲ ἑκαστον καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ μὲν κατηγορίας ἄξιόν· καὶ γὰρ τὸ μεθύειν χωρὶς τοῦ παρορᾶν πένητας ἔγκλημα, καὶ τὸ παρορᾶν πένητας χωρὶς τοῦ μεθύειν κατηγορία· ὅταν δὲ καὶ ὁμοῦ συνημμένα ᾖ, ἐννόησον ὅση ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς παρανομίας.

We append without change, the translation of this passage made "by members of the English Church," (Oxford, 1845.)

We use this not because it is altogether satisfactory, for it is not; but it is at least impartial so far as this controversy is concerned, and, unsatisfactory as it is, we believe it amply vindicates our representation of Chrysostom's exegesis.

For having said this, he added again, *and one is hungry and another is drunken*, each of which showed a want of moderation, both the craving and the excess. See also a second fault again, whereby those same persons are injured: the first, that they dishonor their supper; the second, that they are greedy and drunken; and, what is yet worse, even when the poor are hungry. For what was intended to be set before all in common, that these men fed on alone, and proceeded both to surfeiting and to drunkenness. Wherefore neither did he say, *one is hungry, and another is filled*, but *is drunken*. Now each of these, even by itself, is worthy of censure: for it is a fault to be drunken, even without despising the poor, and to despise the poor without being drunken is an accusation. When both these are joined together at the same time, consider how exceeding great is the transgression.

Whatever else may be true of this extract from Chrysostom, it is very plain that it discovers something more in the verb *μεθύω*, as used in the passage in question, than the single and simple idea of drunkenness. As *πεινᾷ* contains the general idea of need, (*ἔνδεια*,) so *μεθύει* embraces the idea of excess in general, (*ὑπερβολή*.) And in his exegesis of the verb, Chrysostom is compelled in each instance to employ two terms, one looking to over-eating and the other to over-drinking, to bring out its full force. For example, he says, *γαστρίζονται καὶ μεθύουσι*, "they eat and drink to the full;" and again, *καὶ εἰς ἀπληστίαν καὶ εἰς μέθην ἐξέβαινον*, "they proceeded both to surfeiting (or gluttony) and to drunkenness." We regard this as sufficient evidence of the truth of our position. We add, however, the corroborative testimony of Dr. Bloomfield, who takes precisely the same view of Chrysostom's comment on this passage. He says, ("Resc. Syn.," vi, 539:)

"Ος δὲ μεθύει. The ancient commentators rightly notice that the *ratio oppositi* requires this word to be taken of repletion, if not excess, both in *eating* and *drinking*. Schleusner confines it to eating. But this would necessarily increase the catachresis. Chrysostom rightly includes both, explaining, *δεῖπνον ἀτιμάζουσι, ὅτι γαστρίζονται καὶ μεθύουσι*. It is not, however, necessary to suppose any excess of drinking, but merely drinking to satiety. The crime imputed to them is not drunkenness or gluttony, but gross and rapacious selfishness at a feast united with the Lord's, and formed

on such principles of love and Christian communion as should be a proper introduction to it.

Bengel says, ("Gnomon," *in loc.:*)

Et alius quidem (non habeus) *esurit*, (et sitit:) *alius vero* (habens, saturatur et) *ebrius est.* Alter plus justo habet sibi, alter minus. "*And one indeed* (inasmuch as he has not) *is hungry*, (and thirsty;) *but another* (inasmuch as he has, is surfeited) *and drunken.* The one has more than is good for him, the other less."

J.

Alcohol an Artificial Product.

(P. 51.)

We add a few of the more recent testimonies of science to the fact that alcohol is always a purely artificial product.

Alcohol does not occur in nature.—Spon's "Encyclopedia of the Industrial Arts," etc. London, 1879. Div. I, p. 192.

Alcohol does not exist in nature, but is produced by a number of reactions.—Witthaus' "General Medical Chemistry," New York, 1881, p. 169.

Alcohol is an artificial product, obtained by fermentation, and is never found in a simple state.—Nathan Allen, M.D., in "The Effects of Alcohol on Offspring." New York, 1882, p. 14.

K.

The Use of Alcohol as a Medicine.

(P. 101.)

At the annual meeting of "The American Medical Association" held in St. Paul, Minn., June, 1882, the following resolution was adopted, ("The Medical Record," New York, June 24, 1882.)

We, the undersigned, members of the medical profession of the United States, unite in the declaration that we believe alcohol should be classed with other powerful drugs; that when prescribed it should be done with conscientious caution and a sense of great responsibility.

L.

The Effect of Alcohol always Narcotic.

(Pp. 109–111.)

After the above-mentioned pages were in type we came across several very strong and impartial corroborations of the argument which we had there urged. We quote them here:

We speak of all alcoholics universally as "stimulants," and people are not quick to see that occasional or habitual "stimulation" to a mild degree is fraught with danger. The fact, too little insisted on, is that these agents are narcotics as well, and, nine times out of ten, the man who flatters himself that he is "stimulated" is presenting the symptoms of incipient narcosis. The instruments of precision with which the physiologist is armed enable him to read better than in former times the phenomena which are the subject of his observations. With a thermometer to tell him of a lowered temperature; with a sphygmograph by which the heart shall trace the unmistakable evidence of its own growing impotence, there is no need to wait for so gross a manifestation as "drunkenness" to indicate the pernicious influence of alcohol. Long before the cerebro-spinal system shows signs of succumbing by the staggering gait and the faltering tongue, the sympathetic nervous system evinces unmistakable symptoms of paralysis; and the flushed face, the quickened pulse, the lowered temperature, the diminished blood-pressure, give painful evidence of a profound disorder in the machinery of nutrition.—W. G. Harrison, Jun., M.D., in a paper on "Certain Effects of Alcohol in Relation to Life Insurance," presented at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association in Baltimore, Md., November 11, 1875, and published in the "Reports," etc., vol. ii, p. 281.

Dr. B. W. Richardson, in his latest utterance on the alcohol question, already cited in Appendix A, says, (p. 16:)

In this manner by the course of experiment I learned, step by step, that *the true action of alcohol, in a physiological point of view, is to create paralysis of nervous power.* It acts precisely as I had seen nitrite of amyl and some other chemical bodies act.

Dr. James Muir Howie, already quoted in Appendix A, says, on p. 18 of the same work:

In fact, all the latest scientific experiments tend to confirm the truth of the proposition which I now lay before you, namely, that all stimulants are narcotics and all narcotics stimulants; or

in other words, that stimulant and narcotic effects are not independent phenomena produced by two different classes of agents, but that these phenomena are inseparably connected, both being the necessary effects of the same class of agents, and both being manifested in an invariable sequence, so that stimulus always precedes narcotism, and, more or less, narcotism invariably follows stimulus. And such being the case, it must be evident to all that the occasions must be exceedingly rare on which a stimulant will be really useful to any man, whether in health or disease. Since I became convinced of the truth of this principle, I have had abundant opportunity of testing its correctness in the conducting of a large and varied private practice in Liverpool during the last six years. And my predecessor and former partner, Dr. Burrows, who conducted the same practice for nearly forty years previously, gives similar evidence, at least in so far as alcoholic stimulants are concerned.

M.

The Methodist Discipline on Temperance.

(P. 126.)

The "Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church" adds the weight of its ecclesiastical sanction to our definition of the New Testament virtue of temperance. It says, (¶ 36, edition of 1880:)

Temperance in its broader meaning is distinctively a Christian virtue, scripturally enjoined. It implies a subordination of all the emotions, passions, and appetites to the control of reason and conscience. Dietetically, it means a wise use of useful articles of food and drink, *with entire abstinence from such as are known to be hurtful.* Both science and human experience unite with the Holy Scriptures in condemning all alcoholic beverages as being neither useful nor safe. The business of manufacturing and vending such liquors is also against the principles of morality, political economy, and the public welfare. We therefore regard voluntary abstinence from all intoxicants as the true ground of personal temperance, and complete legal prohibition of the traffic in alcoholic drinks as the duty of civil government.

GENERAL INDEX.

Abbott, Lyman, quoted, 68, 86, 100, 107, 140.
Abyssinian Church, the, uses unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, 92.
Abstinence, practiced in antiquity, 11; enjoined by the law of self-denial, 99; by the law of the avoidance of temptation, 103; by the law of love, 104; by the law of perfection, 107; and the doctrine of Christian expediency, 105; especially enjoined upon women, 116; New Testament terms for, 119; included in the idea of temperance, 125, 126, 152; the practice and teaching of Christ, 130; of the Apostles, 144.
Acetum, 96.
Adler, G. J., quoted, 142.
'Αεὶ γλεῦκος, 30.
Ælian, quoted, 11, 129.
Æschylus, quoted, 32, 122.
Agapæ, the abuses of, 60, 88.
Ainsworth, W. F., quoted, 94.
Ainsworth, R., quoted, 141.
אָכַל, *akal*, 43, 74.
Alcohol, physiological action of, 3–7; food value of, 6, 131, 134; and life insurance, 7, 135; as a medicine, 7, 71, 101, 131, 150; temperature at which it evaporates, 29; a purely artificial product, 54, 150; always a poison, 71, 80, 131, 135; maximum amount of, that may be taken without perceptibly injurious effect, 110; effect of, always narcotic, 110, 134, 151; does not add energy, 133.
Alexandre, quoted, 141.
Alford, Dean, quoted, 22, 70, 95, 101, 117, 127.
Allen, J., quoted, 78.
Allen, Dr. N., quoted, 150.
Alvarez, quoted, 93.
Ambrose, quoted, 89, 91.
American Medical Association, the resolutions of, as to the use of alcohol as a medicine, 150.
'Αμπελος, 32, 86.
Amphora, 29, 66.
עֲנָבִים, *anabim*, 48.
Anacreon, quoted, 14, 32, 59.
'Ανανήφω, 121.
Andrews, E. A., quoted, 142.
Anstie, Dr., quoted, 4, 6, 110.
Aorist, the use of, 69.
'Απαρνέομαι, 99.
Appetite, alcoholic, natural history of the, 102.
Appleton's "American Cyclopædia," quoted, 29, 66.
Aquinas, Thomas, quoted, 91.
Archilochus, quoted, 123.
'Αρχιοινοχόος, 83.
Aristophanes, quoted, 123.
Aristotle, quoted, 19, 22, 32, 59, 118, 120, 127.
אֲשִׁישָׁה, *ashishah*, 45.
עֲסִיס, *asis*, 47, 68.
'Ασκοί, 63–67.
'Ασωτία, 117.
Assyria, drunkenness in, 10.
Athenæus, quoted, 11, 19, 28, 32, 55, 114, 122.
Athletes and total abstinence, 7.
Augustine, quoted, 54, 146.
Aulus Gellius, quoted, 76.

Babylon, drunkenness in, 10.
Barnes, Albert, quoted, 18.
Barry, Sir Edward, quoted, 28, 142.
Bartenora, rabbi, quoted, 77.
Βαρυνθῶσιν, 108, 112.
Basil, quoted, 91.
Beecher, Charles, quoted, 78, 79.
Beecher, H. W., quoted, 9.
Beecher, W. J., quoted, 85, 88.
Benediction, the cup of, 79.
Benfey, T., quoted, 58.
Bengel, J. A., quoted, 53, 60, 87, 119, 150.
Bernier, F., quoted, 84.
Bevan, Vicar, quoted, 45, 64.
Beza, version of, quoted, 14, 60.
Bilroth, quoted, 60.
Bingham, "Antiquities of the Christian Church," quoted, 90, 91.
Binz, Professor, quoted, 4, 6.
Bishops, abstinence required of, 115.
Bishop's Bible, the, quoted, 46.
Blood, fermented wine not a proper symbol of, 81.
Blood of the grape, the, 45, 49, 73, 144.

Blood, the, of Christ, unfermented wine its proper symbol, 83.
Bloomfield, S. T., quoted, 59, 60, 86, 118, 127, 128, 149.
Bouvier, quoted, 111.
Braga, the Council of, 91.
Brerewood, quoted, 93.
Brown, D., quoted, 60.
Bruce, J., quoted, 66, 92.
Bruehl, J. H., quoted, 77.
Brunton, Dr., quoted, 80.
Bumstead, Professor H., quoted, 1, 2, 3, 8, 17, 20, 35, 40, 42, 43, 45, 47, 48, 51, 57, 61, 62, 64, 65, 67, 72, 75, 84, 101, 105, 106, 108, 109, 114, 117, 126, 129, 146.
Burckhardt, J., quoted, 66.
Bush, George, quoted, 18.
Bythner, quoted, 40.
Byzantius, quoted, 122, 127.

Cæsar, quoted, 126.
Carver, Dr., an abstainer, 7.
Cana, the miracle at, 53; its method, 54, 146; its object, 60; its result, 62.
Carenum, 27, 33.
Carmichael, Dr. N., quoted, 54.
Carpenter, Dr. W. B., quoted, 110, 134.
Cato, quoted, 22, 29, 32, 33.
Celsus, quoted, 126.
חֲמַר, *chamar*, חֲמָרָא, *chamrâ*, and חֵמֶר, *chemer*, 44.
חֲמֵץ, *chametz*, 74.
Chapital, quoted, 54.
Chardin, J., quoted, 66.
Chassang, quoted, 121, 122, 127, 141.
China, drunkenness in, 10.
חֹמֶץ, *chometz*, 50, 96.
Christison, R., quoted, 37.
Chrysostom, quoted, 54, 60, 89, 91, 128, 147, 148.
Cicero, quoted, 126.
Circumstances, change in, as a ground for setting aside Christ's example in the use of wine, 9.
Clarke, Adam, quoted, 21, 60, 87, 115, 116, 124.
Clement, A., quoted, 91, 113, 118, 121, 128.
Coan, Dr. T. M., quoted, 5.
Cola, a regular accompaniment of the wine-press, 25.
Color, the, of grape-juice, 81, 144.
Columella, quoted, 19, 20, 24, 25, 48, 66, 139.
Conant, T. J., quoted, 60.
Constance, the Council of, 89.
Conybeare and Howson, quoted, 129.
Coptic Church, the, uses unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, 93.
Corinthians, the, mistake of as to the law of Christian liberty, 106; their abuse of the agapæ, 88.
Cornelius á Lapide, quoted, 60.
Corruptions of primitive Christianity, 89.
Cosgrove, Dr., quoted, 136.
Corruptus, used in the sense of fermented, 75.
Coverdale's version, quoted, 46.
Cowles, H. A., quoted, 57, 88.
Cranmer's Bible, quoted, 46, 56, 129.
Cratinus, quoted, 114.
Cremer "Biblico-Theological Lexicon," quoted, 99.
Criminals, mixture given to, at their execution, 94.
Crosby, Chancellor H., quoted, 1, 2, 9, 17, 72, 102, 114, 124, 125, 130.
Cross, Christ's use of wine on the, 94.
Cup, the, of the Lord, contrasted with the cup of devils, 89.
Cup, the, all disciples commanded to drink of, 80; withholding of, from the laity, 80, 89.
Curtius, G., quoted, 58, 126.
Cyprian, quoted, 91.

דַּם־עֲנָבִים, *Dam-anabim*, 49.
Daub, quoted, 111.
Davidson, quoted, 115.
Davis, Dr. N. S., quoted, 7.
Davy, Sir H., quoted, 54.
דְּבַשׁ, *debash*, 49, 76, 114.
Defrutum, 27, 33, 48.
Dema, the, 73.
Democritus, quoted, 27.
De Wette, quoted, 60.
Dibs, 27, 50.
Dickinson, Dr. W. H., quoted, 5.
"Dictionaire de l'Acadamie Francaise," quoted, 142.
Digestion, alcohol not an aid to, 132.
Dindorf, W., quoted, 39, 41.
Diodorus Siculus, quoted, 85.
Diogenes Laertius, quoted, 56, 127.
Dionysius Barsalibi, quoted, 92.
Dioscorides, quoted, 31, 71.
Discipline, the Methodist Episcopal, on temperance, 152.
Distillation, discovery of, 20.
Distilled and fermented liquors, attempted distinction between, 5.
Dittmar, Prof., quoted, 24, 25, 65, 137.
Donnegan, quoted, 120, 122, 144.
Dream of Pharoah's chief butler, 21.
Drink-offerings, nature of, 72.
Drunkenness, in ancient times, 10; a condition of insalvableness, 118; prohibitions of, in the N. T., 108.
Duarté Barbosa, quoted, 93.

Duff, A., quoted, 20, 136, 137.
Duffield, G., quoted, 81.
Dulcia vina, 34.
Durandus, quoted, 91, 92.
Duschab, 28.

Easter, canon of the African Church concerning the offerings for, 90.
Ebers, G. M., quoted, 10, 22.
Ebrius, used in the sense of saturate, 59.
"Ecce Deus," quoted, 61.
Edmunds, Dr. J., 133.
Ἐγκράτεια, 126, 128, 130; ἐγκρατῆ, 115, 121; ἐγκρατής, 128; ἐγκρατεύομαι, 128.
Egypt, drunkenness in, 10.
Egyptians, their use of fresh grape-juice as a beverage, 21; wine-presses of, 24.
Ἐκνήφω, 121.
Ellicott, Bishop, quoted, 53, 87, 94, 95, 102, 106, 120.
Elyot, Sir Thomas, quoted, 125.
Encratites, the, 128.
Epictetus, quoted, 7, 129.
Epistles, the, contain Christ's revealed will, 108.
Ἔφημα, 27, 33.
Essenes, the, total abstinence of, 11, 123.
Eucharist, the, incompatibility of the intoxicating cup with, 80.
Eusebius, quoted, 144.
Ewald, "Antiquities of Israel," quoted, 76.
Example of Christ, the, importance of, 2.
Excess not simply prohibited by the Scriptures, 109.
Exhilaration, a stage of intoxication, 110.
Expediency, Christian, the doctrine of, 104.

Fanfani, P., quoted, 142.
Farrar, Canon, quoted, 18, 77, 129.
Fermentation, definition of, 23; methods of preventing, known to the ancients, 23; prevention of, by separation of the gluten, 23; by expulsion of the moisture, 25; by exclusion of the air, 29; by lowering the temperature, 29; by sulphur fumigation, 30; power of, 64; after-fermentation, 64; spontaneous, slow in beginning, 65, 137.
Filters, used in wine-making, 24.
First-fruits, the bread and wine of the holy communion regarded as, 90.
Forbiger, Dr., quoted, 139.
Forcellini, E., quoted, 141.
Fou, the Scotch, use of, 59.
Freshman, J., quoted, 77.
Freund, W., quoted, 142.
Fruit of the vine, the, 51, 85.
Fruits, the liquor of, not liable to fermentation, 77.
Fürst, J., 31, 40, 74.

Galvanometer, the use of, in detecting the effect of small doses of alcohol, 111.
Games, ancient, training of competitors in, 129.
Ganod, Dr., quoted, 110.
Geikie, C., quoted, 22, 54, 86, 148.
Geneva Bible, the, quoted, 56, 129.
Γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου, 51, 85.
Geoponica, the, quoted, 23, 24, 29, 71, 139.
Gesenius, F. H. W., quoted, 38, 40, 41, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 74, 100.
Γλευκίνον, 71; γλευκίνος, 141.
Γλεῦκος, Suidas' definition of, 22; original use as adjective with *οἶνος*, 33; designated as *οἶνος* by Aristotle; use of, in the N. T., 51, 143; used to excess by the ancients, 114; defined as wine by modern authorities, 141.
Γλύξις, 27, 33.
Gill, J., quoted, 14.
Glory, the miracle at Cana a revelation of Christ's, 61.
Gobat, Bishop, quoted, 92.
Godet, quoted, 70.
Gottheil, G., quoted, 77.
Grain, prohibition at Passover of all liquors made from, 76.
Grape, juice of the, ingredients of, 23; temperature at which it boils, 29; use of, as a beverage, 20, 136; called wine, 32; color of, 144.
Grapes, the preservation of, in grape-growing countries, 83; easily procurable for the Last Supper, 84; the practice of pressing directly into the cup, 90.
Greece, drunkenness in, 10.
Greene, Dr. R., quoted, 131.
Green, quoted, 120, 122.
Gregory of Nyassa, quoted, 91.
Grotius, H., quoted, 60, 118.
Gull, Sir William, quoted, 3.

Hadley, J., "Greek Grammar," quoted, 69, 70.
Hall, Bishop, quoted, 54, 150.
Hallam, "Literature of Europe," quoted, 125.
Hanlan, abstinence of, 7.
Harper's "Latin Dictionary," quoted, 22, 33, 126, 142.
Harrison, Dr. W. G., Jun., quoted, 151.
Hazlitt, William, held up as a sot, 15.
Health, use of alcohol in, 7, 131.
Henry, Matthew, quoted, 21.

Herodotus, quoted, 21, 31, 123.
Hesiod, quoted, 32.
Hesychius, quoted, 58, 122.
Heyse, K., quoted, 142.
Hieratic Papyri, quoted, 11.
Hippocrates, quoted, 34, 59.
Hobbes, T., quoted, 125.
Hodge, Dr. A. A., quoted, 140.
Homer, quoted, 28, 59, 115.
Homes, Henry, quoted, 26.
Honey of grapes, 50.
Horace, quoted, 11, 30, 129; Delphin, notes on, quoted, 25.
Howie, Dr. J. M., quoted, 133, 151.
Hunt, Dr. E. M., quoted, 6, 101, 103.

Imperfect moral development of his age, as a ground for setting aside Christ's example as to wine, 8.
"Independent," the, quoted, 8, 146.
India, drunkenness in, 10.
Inebrio, in the sense of saturate, 59.
Inerticula, the grape called, 19.
Ingalls, Dr. E., quoted, 132.
Inspissation of fresh grape juice, 26.
Irenæus, quoted, 90.
Isaacs, S. M., quoted, 78.

Jacobus, M. W., quoted, 18, 57, 139.
Jacolliot, "The Bible in India," quoted, 11.
Jahn, "Biblical Archeology," quoted, 67.
James, Prof. William, quoted, 5, 136.
Jamieson, quoted, 60.
James, Saint, a total abstainer, 144.
Jerome, quoted, 100, 116.
Jesus charged with being a moderate drinker, 1; example of, determinative in the matter of total abstinence, 2, 13; self-denial of, 7; example of, in the use of wine set aside on the ground of the imperfect moral development of his age, 8; example of, not limited by locality or age, 12; example of, in the use of wine contrasted with the abstinence of John the Baptist, 16; charged with making intoxicating wine, 17, 53; with commending it, 17, 63; with using it, 17, 71; miracles of, always miracles of mercy, 61; blood of, cannot be symbolized by fermented wine, 82; his use of wine on the cross, 94; dealt mainly in general principles, 98; his prohibitions of drunkenness, 108; a total abstainer, 97, 130.
Jews, two schools of, 78.
Johnson, S., quoted, 143.
John the Baptist, the abstinence of, contrasted with Christ's use of wine, 16; promise concerning, 117.
John, Saint, the Christians of, use unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, 93.
Josephus, quoted, 32, 76, 83, 123, 127.
Julius I., Pope, decree of, 91.
Jürgens, quoted, 142.
Justin Martyr, quoted, 91, 128.
Juvenal, quoted, 11.

Καινός, construction of, in the record of the Lord's Supper, 86; distinguished from νέος, 86.
Keil and Delitzsch, quoted, 74, 76.
Κέραμος, 29.
Κεράννυμι, 46.
Kerr, Dr. N., quoted, 18, 30, 44, 65, 81, 82, 84, 113, 138, 139.
Khosab, 26.
Kingsbury, Vicar, quoted, 56.
Kitto, "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," quoted, 30, 75, 96.
Knobel, quoted, 74.
Κῶμοι, 113.
Κραιπάλη, 108, 113.
Κρασί, 31.
Kuinoel, quoted, 60, 86.
Kurtz, quoted, 74.

Lacedæmonians, the, the boiled wines of, 27.
"Lancet," the London, quoted, 131.
Lane, E. W., quoted. 26.
Lange, J. P., quoted, 53, 70, 88, 117.
Lankester, Dr. E., quoted, 139.
Lateran Council, the, 89.
Latin Church, the, its use of the expressed juice of the grape in celebrating the Lord's Supper, 92.
Laurie, Thomas, quoted, 49.
Leaven, prohibited at the Passover, 73; the symbol of corruption, 75; prohibition of, applied to the greater part of the Jewish ritual, 76; reason for its exclusion from the sacrifices, 76; prohibited in all offerings where Christ was typified, 82.
Lees, Dr. F. R., quoted, 18, 37, 38, 40, 41, 59, 85.
Lees, wines on the, 46.
Legalistic interpretation of the Scriptures in support of moderate drinking, 109.
Legge, "Chinese Classics," quoted, 10.
Lewis, Tayler, quoted. 3, 18, 39.
Liberty, Christian, its sphere, 105.
Liddell and Scott, quoted, 46, 58, 69, 99, 107, 113, 118, 120, 121, 122, 141.
Liebig, Baron, quoted, 39, 54.
Life insurance and alcohol, 7, 135.
Lightfoot, J., quoted, 95.
Liquor, the, of grapes, 49.

Littleton, quoted, 141.
Littre, M. quoted, 142.
Livy, quoted, 126.
Lord's Supper, the, emblems of, 39; circumstances under which it was instituted, 72; language in which its institution is recorded, 79; corruptions of, 89; celebration in the early Church, 90.
Longmuir, quoted, 143.
Love, the law of, 104
Lowth, Bishop, quoted, 21, 43.
Lucian, quoted, 114.
Lüneman, quoted, 141.

M'Culloch, Dr. J. M., quoted, 110.
M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, quoted, 73, 74.
M'Curdy, J. F., "Relations of the Aryan and Semitic Languages," quoted, 31.
Macdonald, Dr., quoted, 86.
Macgregor, J., quoted, 138.
Macknight, J., quoted, 60.
Macleod, Norman, quoted, 44, 49.
Macrobius, quoted, 75.
Maimonides, rabbi, quoted, 77.
Malcom, "Travels," etc., quoted, 11.
מַמְתַּקִּים, *mamtaqqim*, 50, 73.
Manipulus Curatorum, the, quoted, 91.
Mansel, Dean, quoted, 87.
Markham, Dr., quoted, 5.
Maron, the wine of, given to Ulysses, 28.
Matthew, "The Acts and Martyrdom of," quoted, 90.
מַצּוֹת, *matzoth*, 74.
Maudsley, Dr. H., quoted, 4.
Medicine, the use of alcohol as a, 7, 71, 101, 131, 132.
Μέθη, 108, 113; *μεθύω*, 44, 58, 113, 117, 148; *μέθυσος*, 113.
Merriman, Daniel, quoted, 102.
מְסֵכָה, *mesek*, מִמְסָךְ, *mimsak*, and מֶזֶג, *mezeg*, 46.
Meyer, quoted, 54, 55, 72, 83, 87, 105, 106, 117, 118, 147.
Michaelis, quoted, 21.
Milton, J., quoted, 125.
Milk, included in the prohibition of leaven, 76; excessive use of, in ancient times, 114.
Miller, Philip, quoted, 138.
Milo, abstinence of, 7.
Mind, the effect of alcohol on, 99.
מִשְׁרַת־עֲנָבִים, *mishrath-anabim*, 49.
Moderate drinking, leads to drunkenness, 102; absurdity of the exegesis which favors, 111; the scriptural argument for, purely inferential, 112.
Moore, Dr. Dunlop, quoted, 1, 2, 15, 17, 19, 22, 23, 24, 26, 29, 35, 36, 40, 43, 56, 69, 72, 77, 95, 108, 109, 115, 137, 138, 144, 148.
Mossop, Dr., quoted, 111.
Most, 142; *Mosto*, 142; *Moût*, 142.
Mounsey, Sec'y, quoted, 84.
Mulsum, 36.
Mulvaney, Dr., quoted, 111.
Must, 91, 143.
Mustang grape, the, 145.
Mustum, definitions of, 22, 141; *lixivium*, 24; how kept sweet, 29; designated as *vinum*, 32; use as an adjective, 33; *mustum oleo*, 71; used in celebrating the Lord's Supper, 91.
Myrrhina wine, 34.

Narcosis, produced by alcohol, 110, 151.
Nardenk, 27.
Nast, William, quoted, 87.
Nazarites, abstinence of, 11.
Nebeedh, 26.
Nelson, quoted, 93.
Νηφάλεον, 115, 116, 121; *νήφω*, 121; *νήψις*, 123.
Nestorians, the, use unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, 93.
Neumann, analysis of, 20.
Newcome, quoted, 60.
Nicander, quoted, 32.
Nichol, "Manual of Chemistry," quoted, 23.
Nicol, Dr., quoted, 111.
Niebuhr, quoted, 83.
Noah, intoxication of, 10.
Norton, A., quoted, 60.
Nott, Eliphalet, quoted, 18.
Nuttall, quoted, 143.

Ogilvie, quoted, 143.
Οἶνη, the ancient name for the vine, 32.
Οἰνοπότης, 14.
Οἶνος, *γλυκύς*, 19; *ἀμπέλινος*, 21; *σίραιον*, 27, 33; New Testament use of, 50, 51, 64; a generic term, 50, 113; nowhere used with reference to the Lord's Supper, 84; nature of that offered to Christ on the cross, 94.
Old Testament, the, the key to the New, 34.
Olearus, Adam, quoted, 28.
Oleum gleucinum, 70.
Olshausen, H., quoted, 54, 117, 124, 147.
Ὀ*νέλαιον*, 71.
Ophthalmoscope, used in detecting the effect of minute doses of alcohol, 111.
Opimian wine, 28.
Orfilla, quoted, 37.

Oriental Churches, the, use unfermented wine in celebrating the Lord's Supper, 92.
Origen, quoted, 100, 121.
Osorius, Bishop, quoted, 93.
Οὐδείς and οὐδὲ εἷς, use of, 69.
Ovid, quoted, 115.
Ὄξος, use of, in N. T., 51; drank by Christ on the cross, 94; its nature, 96.

Palestine, drunkenness in, 11; the wines of, 140.
Palladius, quoted, 27.
Pallas, quoted, 48.
Palm-tree, the fresh juice of, a common drink, 44.
Paræus, quoted, 128.
Parkes, Dr., quoted, 4, 6, 7, 110, 135.
Parkinson, J., quoted, 33.
Πάροινος, 115, 116, 121.
Passover, the, the occasion of the institution of the Lord's Supper, 72; the law of, 73, 75; the wine of, 73.
Passow, quoted, 115, 141.
Passum, 24, 26, 33.
Pasteur and Hallier, researches of, 29.
Patrick, Bishop, quoted, 57.
Paul, St., his conception of temperance 129.
Peabody, A. P., quoted, 78, 84.
Peile's "Etymology," quoted, 44, 57.
Πειρασμόν, 102.
Peppini, Signor, quoted, 84.
Perfection, the law of, 107.
Persia, drunkenness in, 10.
Persius, quoted, 11, 75.
Pesca, 96.
Petronius, quoted, 11.
Φάγος, 14.
Phillips, Wendell, quoted, 2.
Philo, quoted, 55, 59, 123.
Pickering, J., quoted, 121, 127, 141.
Pineau grape, the, 145.
Plato, quoted, 99, 120, 123.
Plautus, quoted, 126.
Pliny, quoted, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 59, 71.
Plumb, A. H., quoted, 9, 12.
Plumptre, E. H., quoted, 122.
Plutarch, quoted, 29, 59, 76, 122.
Poison, fermented wine described as a, in the Scriptures, 38.
Polybius, quoted, 14, 85, 116.
Poor, Dr., quoted, 88.
Pope, William B., quoted, 89.
Porphyry, quoted, 123.
Posca, 96.
Pott, A. F., quoted, 58.
Potter, Alonzo, quoted, 18.
Potter, Archbishop, quoted, 27.
Precepts, particular of Christ, as to abstinence, 108.
Pressensé, E., quoted, 89.
Prejudice, and the interpretation of God's word, 19.
Principles, general, of Christ enforcing abstinence, 97.
Prelum, 24, 25.
Proclus, quoted, 32.
Πρόδρομος, 33.
Πρόχυμα, 23.
Protropum, 23, 33, 73.
Purim, the feast of, drunkenness at, 11.

Raisins, wine made from, 26.
Ramsey, Prof., quoted, 33.
Rawlinson, "Five Great Monarchies," quoted, 10.
Rechabites, abstinence of, 11.
Reformed drunkards and fermented wine at the Lord's table, 81.
Renan, E., "Lang. Sem.," quoted, 31.
Rheims version, the, quoted, 128.
Rich, A. B., quoted, 69.
Rich, "Dictionary of Antiquities," quoted, 142.
Richardson, Dr. B. W., quoted, 4, 5, 7, 33, 54, 69, 82, 99, 100, 102, 132, 151.
Riegel, quoted, 111.
Ringer, Dr., quoted, 6.
Riparia grape, the, 149.
Robinson, E., quoted, 40, 69, 84, 115, 122.
Rome, drunkenness in, 11.
Rosenmüller, quoted, 21, 60, 86, 127.
Ross, quoted, 93.
Rule, W. H., quoted, 57, 114.

Salt, the reason of its requirement in Jewish offerings, 76.
Samarcandi grape, the, 146.
Samaritan, the good, his use of wine, 71.
Samson, abstinence of, 7.
Samson, G. W., quoted, 18, 40, 41.
Sapa, 27, 33.
שַׂר חַמּשָׁקִים, *sar ham-mashqim*, 83.
Schleusner, quoted, 121, 122, 127.
Schœttgen, quoted, 95, 118.
Schützenberger, "Fermentation," quoted, 23.
Scudamore, quoted, 92.
Self-denial, the law of, 98.
Semper mustum, 30.
Seneca, quoted, 11.
שְׁאוֹר, *seor*, 74.
Septuagint, the, quoted, 14, 39, 44, 46, 47, 48, 56, 59, 68, 83, 85, 94, 123, 127.

Sera, 96.
Sextus, Empiricus, quoted, 127.
שֵׁכָר, *shechar*, 43.
שְׁמָרִים, *shemarim*, 46.
Short, "On the Order of Words in the Attic Greek Prose," quoted, 118.
Σίκερα, 51.
Sin, the use of alcoholic drinks a, 27.
Σκανδαλίζω, 100.
Skeats W. W., quoted, 143.
Skin-bottles, used to hold wine, 60–67.
Slavery defended from the Bible on the same ground as wine-drinking, 8, 18.
Smith, Dr. Edward, quoted, 64.
Smith, J., quoted, 98, 99.
Smith, W., "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities," quoted, 19, 22, 24, 27, 33, 65, 139; "Bible Dictionary," quoted, 40, 64, 72; "Latin Dictionary," quoted, 142.
Smith, W. R., quoted, 76.
סֹבֶא, *sobe*, 48.
Sobriety, injunctions to, in the N. T., 119.
Sophocles, quoted, 122.
Sophocles, Prof., quoted, 141.
Σώφρων, 116, 117, 120; σωφρονέω, σωφρονίζω, σωφρόνως, and σωφροσύνη, 120.
Soûler, use of, 59.
סֹבְאֵי יָיִן, *sovai-yayin*, 14.
Spartianus, quoted, 96.
Sphygmograph, the, use of, in detecting effect of small doses of alcohol, 111, 151.
Spier and Surenne, quoted, 59, 142.
Spirit, the, fullness of, contrasted with fullness of wine, 117.
Spon's "Encyclopædia," quoted, 150.
Stanley, Dean, quoted, 60, 89, 90, 92, 93.
Stephanus, quoted, 122.
Story, "On Alcohol," quoted, 89.
Stuart, Moses, 18, 21, 35, 39, 50, 57.
Suicer, "Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus," quoted, 100, 128.
Suidas, quoted, 22, 99, 113, 122, 127.
Sulphur fumigation of wine, 30.
Sweetnesses, the feast of, 73.
Swinburne, "Travels," quoted, 83.
Symbolism of the wine of the Supper, 81.
Tacitus, quoted, 11, 75, 126, 128.
Taeniotic wine, 28.
Tahiti, law of, prohibiting the importation of ardent spirits, 98.
Talmud, the, quoted, 11, 30, 73, 75, 76, 77.
Tavernier, Baron, quoted, 93.
Taylor, quoted, 37.
Teinturier grape, the, 145.
Temetum, the ancient name for wine, 31.
"Temperance Bible Commentary," the quoted, 113.
Temperance, inculcations of, in the N. T., 124; signification and use of the term, 125; etymology of, 126; St. Paul's conception of, 129; the Methodist Discipline on, 152.
Temperantia, 124, 126; *tempero* and *temperans*, 126.
Temperature at which fermentation is possible, 29; grape juice boils, 29; alcohol evaporates, 29.
Temptation, the law of, the avoidance of, 102.
Terrence, quoted, 59.
Theodoret, quoted, 91.
Theognis, quoted, 123.
Theophrastus, quoted, 57, 59.
Theophylact, quoted, 86, 118.
Therapeutæ, the abstinence of, 11.
Thermometer, the, use of, in detecting the effect of small doses of alcohol, 111, 151.
Thermopolium, the, 28.
Tholuck, F. A., quoted, 60.
Thomas Magister, quoted, 121.
Thomas, St., the Christians of, use unfermented wine at the Lord's Supper, 93.
Thomson, Sir Henry, quoted, 3, 62.
Thudicum and Dupré, quoted, 6, 64, 145, 146.
Thucydides, quoted, 99.
Tischendorf, C., quoted, 70, 92, 93.
Timothy, his use of wine, 112.
Tinta Francisca grape, the, 145.
תִּירוֹשׁ, *tirosh*, 40.
Transubstantiation, the doctrine of, 89.
Tregelles, S. P., quoted, 70.
Trench, R. C., quoted, 53, 54, 87, 118, 120, 147.
Tuch, quoted, 21.
Turner, E., quoted, 54, 75.
Tyndal's version, quoted, 114, 129.
Ure's "Dictionary of Arts, Manufacturies, and Mines," quoted, 24.
Valpy, quoted, 141.
Van Buren, J. M., quoted, 27.
Vanicek, quoted, 58, 122, 126, 142.
Van Lennep, "Bible Lands," quoted, 27.
Varro, quoted, 22, 26, 27, 32, 33.
Vegetius, quoted, 96.
Vine, the, and its branches? suggestion of the figure of, 86.
Vin, boueux, 140; *cotto*, 27, 28; *cuit*, 28; *ordinaire*, 50.
Vinegar. 50, 51, 60.
Vinum dulce, 19, 24.

Virgil, quoted, 25, 27, 126.
Vitriaco, Jacobus, á, quoted, 91.
Volney, quoted, 57.
Vulgate, the, quoted, 14, 41, 129, 130.

Wafer, the, 90.
Water, the, of life, 87.
Water, the practice of mingling, with wine at the Lord's Supper, 91.
Walker, J., quoted, 143.
Watt's "Dictionary of Chemistry," quoted, 66.
Webster, N., quoted, 143.
Westcott, Canon, quoted, 53.
Westcott and Hort, quoted, 70.
Whedon, Daniel D., quoted, 54, 60, 61, 95, 147.
Whitby, quoted, 60.
White and Riddle, quoted, 142.
Wilkinson's "Ancient Egyptians," quoted, 10, 25.
Witthaus, Dr., quoted, 150.
Wiesinger, quoted, 116, 124.
Wine, ancient, strength of, 20; dilution of, 28, 46; boiled, 27; the fermented juice of the grape not always called, 31; did not always mean the *juice* of the grape, 31; the term used without any reference to the grape, 31; did not always mean the *fermented* juice of the grape, 32; commended and condemned in both Testaments, 34; two kinds of, distinguished in the Scriptures, 34–38; Hebrew words rendered, 38–49; Greek words rendered, 50, 51; summary of the terms for, in the Scriptures, 52; made by Jesus at the marriage feast in Cana, 53; the best, not intoxicating, 55; Aulese, method of making, 64; old, not better than new, 68–70; use of, by the good Samaritan, 71; the, of the Supper, 72–94; the, used on the cross, 94–97; the new, of the coming kingdom, 87; prohibitions of, in the N. T., 108; excessive use of, forbidden without regard to its kind, 114; our opponents' position with regard to the meaning of, 140.
Wine, fermented, composition of, 37; prohibited by the law of the Passover, 77; not a proper symbol of blood in general, 81; or of Christ's blood, 82.
Wine, unfermented, *préjugé légitime* against the doctrine of, 17; scholarship and the doctrine of, 18; existence and use of, in ancient times, 19; a common beverage, 31, 140; recognition of, in the Scriptures, 34; composition of, 37; regarded as the best, 57; the proper symbol of Christ's blood, 83; used in celebrating the Lord's Supper, 72–94; excessive use of, forbidden, 114.
Wine-bibber, a, Christ charged with being, 1, 15; definition of, 14.
Wine-bibbing put on a par with sensuality and gluttony, 16.
Wine-drinking a sin, *per se*, 2.
Winer, "Grammar of the New Testament," quoted, 69, 70, 117.
Woes pronounced by Christ on those who cause temptation, 105.
Women, aged, especially addicted to wine, 115.
Women, strict abstinence enjoined upon, 116.
Woodbury, Dr. F., quoted, 131.
Worcester, J. E., quoted, 143.
Wyckliffe's version, quoted, 14, 60, 128, 129, 130.

Xenophon, quoted, 10, 31, 59, 87, 127, 128.

יַיִן, *yayin*, 38.

יָקֶב, *yeqeb*, 49.

Youmans, E. L., quoted, 110.
Young, "Analytical Concordance," quoted, 141.

TEXTUAL INDEX.

Ch.	Verse.	Page.
	GENESIS.	
1	4	36
2	3	36
9	20–27	10
9	21	38
9	24	123
27	28	40, 42
40	9	83
40	11	21
41	34	85
43	16	74
43	31	127
43	34	44, 59
47	24	85
49	11	40, 49
	EXODUS.	
12	8	75
12	8, 9	76
12	17	74
12	19	78
12	39	75
13	6, 7	73, 75
22	29	73
23	10	85
23	15	73
29	2	73, 76
29	40	40, 72
33	18–23	61
34	26	76
	LEVITICUS.	
2	11	76, 82
2	13	76
6	17	76, 82
8	2	76
10	9	43
17	11	49, 148
23	13	72
23	17	82
24	5–9	76
	NUMBERS.	
6	1–4	11, 16
6	3	49, 50, 74
6	4	39
6	15	76
6	19	73
15	5, 7, 10	40
15	7	72
28	7	43, 44, 72
28	14	72
	DEUTERONOMY.	
11	14	42
12	17	42
14	21	76
14	23	43
14	26	34, 43, 44, 72
16	8	75
16	13	49
21	20	14, 114
22	14–16	43
22	14	49
27	7	74
28	39	39
29	18	94
32	14–16	43
32	14	44, 45, 49
32	33	38
33	28	42
	JUDGES.	
13	7	7
13	14	39
	RUTH.	
2	14	96
	1 SAMUEL.	
9	13	74
25	37	123
	2 SAMUEL.	
6	19	45
	2 CHRONICLES.	
32	28	42
	EZRA.	
6	9	44
7	22	44
	NEHEMIAH.	
5	18	39
8	10	50, 73
13	15	38
	JOB.	
32	19	64, 68
	PSALMS.	
23	5	59
46	3	44
69	12	43
69	21	94, 96
75	8	35, 44, 45, 46, 47
102	9	46
104	15	34, 37, 40, 109
140	3	38
	PROVERBS.	
3	10	42
5	4	94
9	2–5	46
10	26	96
20	1	34, 36
23	20	14
23	21	114
23	29	62
23	30	46
23	31	35, 36, 39, 56
23	32	38
25	20	96
25	27	114
31	6	94
36	6, 7	95
	ECCLESIASTES.	
7	7	43
7	17	111
	CANTICLES.	
2	5	45
5	1	40, 44, 59
5	16	50
7	2	46
7	9	56
8	2	44, 47, 48
	ISAIAH.	
1	22	48
5	22	46
16	10	40
19	14	46
24	7	42
24	9	44
25	6	46
27	2	44, 45
31	7	100
49	26	47, 68
51	17–22	47
55	1	35, 40
62	8	42
63	2, 3	149
63	6	47
65	8	42
65	11	46
	JEREMIAH.	
25	1–19	11
25	15	38
31	14	59
40	10, 11	39
48	11	47
48	33	40
	LAMENTATIONS.	
2	12	40, 41
	DANIEL.	
5	1, 2, 4, 23	44
5	10	10
	HOSEA.	
3	1	48
4	11	43
4	18	48
7	5	38
9	4	72
	JOEL.	
1	5	47, 123
1	10	42
2	24	42
3	18	47
	AMOS.	
9	5	95
9	13	47
	MICAH.	
6	14, 15	41
6	15	42
	NAHUM.	
1	10	48
	HABAKKUK.	
2	7	123
2	15	38
2	19	123

Ch.	Verse.	Page.
	ZEPHANIAH.	
1	12	47
	ECCLESIASTICUS.	
18	30	127
50	14, 15	73
	1 MACCABEES.	
6	34	149
	MATTHEW.	
3	15	79
5	17	79
5	28	36
5	29, 30	100, 101
5	30	126
5	44	109
5	48	107
6	13	102
9	17	51, 63, 64
11	18	15
11	19	1, 16, 114
14	38	102
16	6–12	75
16	24	63, 99, 116
18	7	106
19	19	104
22	39	104
24	49	59
26	19	72
26	27	79, 80
26	28	81, 87
26	29	16, 51, 72, 84, 86
26	34	116
26	41	102
27	34	51, 94, 95
27	48	51, 95
28	20	108
	MARK.	
2	22	51, 63
2	23	51
5	15	120
8	34	99
9	17	51
12	31	104
14	16	72
14	23	79, 80
14	24	81
14	25	51, 84, 86
14	38	102
15	23	51, 94, 95
15	36	51, 95
16	17	87
	LUKE.	
1	15	2, 51, 117
5	37-39	51, 63, 67–70, 86
7	34	1
8	35	120
9	23	99
9	56	61
10	27	104
10	34	51, 71
11	4	102
12	18	85
12	45	59
15	13	118
17	1	106
21	34	108, 111, 113
22	13	72
22	17	79, 80
22	18	51, 77, 84, 86
22	19	83
22	20	81
22	40	102
22	46	102
23	27	95
23	36	51, 95
	JOHN.	
2	1–11	53, 146
2	9	54, 56
2	10	53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 84
2	11	60, 62
3	32, 33	69
4	46	61
5	19	55
13	1, f	86
14	26	108
15	1, 4, 5	86
19	29, 30	51
19	29	95
19	30	95, 96
	ACTS.	
2	4	87
2	13	22, 51, 114, 143
2	15	59
8	27	92
10	38	62
13	37	82
24	25	128
26	25	120
	ROMANS.	
1	20	61
3	10	69
6	4	88
12	3	120
13	9	104
13	10	104
13	12	113
13	13	108, 113
14	1–23	104
14	21	104, 105
15	1	104
	1 CORINTHIANS.	
2	13	108
5	7	75
5	11	108, 113
6	5	69
6	9	62
6	10	108, 113
6	12	106
6	12, 13	104
7	1	35
7	9	128
8	4–13	104
9	25, 26	129
10	16	80, 89
10	19, 21	80, 89
10	19–33	104
11	20, 21	88
11	21	59, 60, 72, 148
11	24	93
11	25	79, 81
14	34	116
15	34	121
	2 CORINTHIANS.	
5	13	120
5	17	87
	GALATIANS.	
5	13	106
5	14	104
5	21	108, 113
5	22	130
6	15	87
	EPHESIANS.	
4	24	87
5	17, 18	117
5	18–36, 59, 84, 108, 112, 113, 116, 118	
	COLOSSIANS.	
3	10	87
	1 THESSALONIANS.	
5	6	124, 129
5	6–8	121
5	7	59
5	22	129
	1 TIMOTHY.	
2	9	120
2	12	116
2	15	120
2	2....115, 120, 121, 124, 130	
3	3	108, 113, 114, 115
3	8	108, 112, 113, 114
3	11	116, 121, 124
4	3	35
5	23	112
6	9, 10	36
	2 TIMOTHY.	
2	26	121
4	5	121
	TITUS.	
1	6	118
1	7	108, 113, 114, 116, 118
1	7, 8	115
1	8	120, 121
2	2	121, 124
2	3	108, 113, 115, 116
2	4	120
2	4, 5	116
2	5	120
2	6	120
2	11, 12	116
2	12	120
	HEBREWS.	
2	18	62
5	2	62
7	26	62
9	13, 14	81
9	14	83
11	24	116
	JAMES.	
1	21	111
2	8	104
5	13	95
	1 PETER.	
1	13	121, 144
2	11	129
4	3	108, 113
4	3, 7	144
4	4	111, 118
4	7	120, 121
5	8	121, 124, 144
	2 PETER.	
1	6	130, 144
3	13	87
	REVELATION.	
2	17	87
3	12	87
5	9	87
14	3	87
17	2, 6	59
19	15	47
21	1, 2, 5, 6	87
22	1, 17	87

ALBERTA C. HARVEY
RT. RT 2 BX 279
MIDDLETOWN, IND.
47356